

THE LEXICAL EFFECTS OF  
ANGLO-SCANDINAVIAN  
LINGUISTIC CONTACT  
ON OLD ENGLISH

## STUDIES IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

*Editorial Board under the auspices of the  
Centre for Medieval Studies, University of York*

Elizabeth M. Tyler, *University of York*  
Julian D. Richards, *University of York*  
Ross Balzaretti, *University of Nottingham*  
Laura Napran (Editorial Assistant)

Previously published volumes in this series are listed at the back of the book.

VOLUME 1

THE LEXICAL EFFECTS OF  
ANGLO-SCANDINAVIAN  
LINGUISTIC CONTACT  
ON OLD ENGLISH

by  
Sara M. Pons-Sanz



BREPOLS

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Pons-Sanz, Sara M., author.

The lexical effects of Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact on Old English.

-- (Studies in the early Middle Ages ; 1)

1. English language--Old English, ca. 450-1100--Etymology.

2. English language--Old English, ca. 450-1100--Foreign words and phrases--Old Norse.

3. Old Norse language--Influence on English.

4. Languages in contact--England--History--To 1500.

I. Title

II. Series

429.2'43961-dc23

ISBN-13: 9782503534718

© 2013, **Brepols Publishers n.v., Turnhout, Belgium**

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,  
electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise,  
without the prior permission of the publisher.

D/2013/0095/177

ISBN: 978-2-503-53471-8

Printed on acid-free paper

## CONTENTS

Tables	vii
Acknowledgements	ix
Abbreviations and Symbols	xi
Chapter 1. Introduction	1
Chapter 2. Etymological Study	25
Chapter 3. Lexico-Semantic Study	123
Chapter 4. The Norse-Derived Terms in their Texts: Some Case Studies	245
Chapter 5. Concluding Remarks	273
Appendix I. Record of the Norse-Derived Terms Attested in Old English Texts	281
Appendix II. Old English Texts Recording Norse-Derived Terms	329
Appendix III. Terms and Structures which Are More Likely to Be Native	397
Appendix IV. Terms in Early Middle English Texts Included in the <i>OEC</i>	469
Bibliography	503
Word Index	561



## TABLES

Table 1, p. 124. The effects of borrowing.

Table 2, p. 126. Classification of the Norse-derived terms according to grammatical categories.

Table 3, p. 128. Classification of the Norse-derived terms into lexico-semantic fields and registers.

Table 4, p. 133. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 1.

Table 5, p. 133. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 1.

Table 6, p. 134. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 2.

Table 7, p. 134. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 2.

Table 8, p. 136. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 3.

Table 9, p. 137. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 3.

Table 10, p. 138. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 4.

Table 11, p. 140. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 4.

Table 12, p. 142. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 5.

Table 13, p. 143. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 5.

Table 14, p. 144. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 6.

Table 15, p. 146. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 6.

Table 16, p. 148. Textual distribution of Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 7.

Table 17, p. 148. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 7.

Table 18, p. 266. The Norse-derived terms and their lemmata in the glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Durham Ritual.

Table 19, p. 268. Number of occurrences of the terms rendering *L servus*.



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

**T**his book would not have been written without the help of many generous colleagues and friends. Firstly, I would like to thank Richard Dance for his continuous support, help, and advice. His input has improved both the content and the format of the book. I also owe much gratitude to the members of the Medieval Section of the School of English at the University of Nottingham: Jayne Carroll, Paul Cavill, Paul Cullen, Judith Jesch, Christina Lee, Richard Marsden, Joanna Martin, David Parsons, Nicola Royan, and Thorlac Turville-Petre. Not only did they provide me with a really enjoyable and friendly work and research environment for many years, but they also advised me on issues as varied as Old Norse linguistics, onomastics, Anglo-Saxon and Scandinavian burial practices, the Anglo-Saxon ecclesiastical calendar, the linguistic features of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and Middle English dialectology. The book has also benefited from the kind support of many scholars who have shared their work and views with me: Thomas Bredehoft, Malasree Home, Tadashi Kotake, Marcin Krygier, Patrizia Lendinara, Kathryn Lowe, Angelika Lutz, D. Gary Miller, whose friendship is a clear example of some of the advantages of the internet, Jean Rumball, William Sayers, Peter Stokes, and Katrin Thier. Furthermore, I would like to thank the anonymous readers for their very useful comments and suggestions. I am however the only one responsible for any mistakes and misunderstandings in the book.

I would not have been able to complete this book without the financial help of the British Academy, which supported me through the Postdoctoral Fellowship scheme from 2004 to 2008. I would also like to acknowledge the financial support which I have received for my research from the Universities of Nottingham and Westminster. That research money has paid for fundamental books, databases, visits to research libraries, and the attendance of conferences. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to the Department of English,

Linguistics and Cultural Studies of the University of Westminster for having granted me time to finish the monograph.

Last but not least I would like to thank my family: my parents and siblings, who have always supported me in what I do, even though they do not understand much of it, and my husband and daughters, who have shown me what is really important in life and have made the writing process (albeit longer) much more fun than it would have otherwise been.

## ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

### *Dictionaries, thesauri, and corpora*

<i>AND</i>	<i>Anglo-Norman Dictionary</i>
<i>DMLBS</i>	<i>Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources</i>
<i>DOE</i>	<i>Dictionary of Old English</i>
<i>EDD</i>	<i>English Dialect Dictionary</i>
<i>MED</i>	<i>Middle English Dictionary</i>
<i>OEC</i>	Web corpus of the <i>Dictionary of Old English</i>
<i>OED</i>	<i>Oxford English Dictionary</i>
<i>ONP</i>	<i>Ordbog over det norrøne prosasprog</i>
<i>TOE</i>	<i>Thesaurus of Old English</i>
<i>VEPN</i>	<i>Vocabulary of English Place-Names</i>

### *Grammatical Information*

acc.	accusative	part.	participle
dat.	dative	pers.	person
gen.	genitive	pl.	plural
ind.	indicative	pres.	present
inf.	infinitive	pret.	preterite
masc.	masculine	sing.	singular
nom.	nominative	subj.	subjunctive

*Languages and Dialects*

Angl.	Anglian	OIr.	Old Irish
Av.	Avestan	OS	Old Saxon
Du.	Dutch	OSl.	Old Slavonic
eWS	early West Saxon	OSwed.	Old Swedish
Fl.	Flemish	OW	Old Welsh
Gr.	Greek	OWN	Old West Norse
Kt.	Kentish	PDE	Present-Day English
L	Latin	PGmc	Proto-Germanic
IOE	late Old English	PNGmc	Proto-North Germanic
IWS	late West Saxon	Skr.	Sanskrit
MDu.	Middle Dutch	Toch.	Tocharian
MHG	Middle High German	VAN	Viking Age Norse
ML	Medieval Latin	WS	West Saxon
MLG	Middle Low German		
MnDa.	Modern Danish		
MnNw.	Modern Norwegian		
MnSwed.	Modern Swedish		
MSwed.	Medieval Swedish		
Nb.	Northumbrian		
NFris.	Northern Frisian		
NGmc	North Germanic		
NWGmc	North-West Germanic		
nWS	non-West Saxon		
ODa.	Old Danish		
OE	Old English		
OEN	Old East Norse		
OFr.	Old French		
OFris.	Old Frisian		
OHG	Old High German		
OIc	Old Icelandic		

*Texts***Old English\***

ÆCorp	Corpus of texts attributed to Ælfric of Eynsham
AldV *	Glosses to Aldhelm's <i>Prosa de virginitate</i>
AnHexa	Anonymous sections of the Old English Hexateuch
Ch Æ	Charters associated with Æthelred's secretariat
Ch Cn	Charters associated with Cnut's secretariat
Ch Ecf	Charters associated with Edward the Confessor's secretariat
Ch IHen	Charters associated with Henry I's secretariat
Ch IWm	Charters associated with William the Conqueror's secretariat
ChronÆC	Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut
ChronAbing	<i>Abingdon Chronicle</i>
ChronCom	Common stock of the <i>Anglo-Saxon Chronicle</i> (up to 890)
ChronCont1	First Continuation of the <i>Anglo-Saxon Chronicle</i> (891 x 924)
ChronE (Irvine)	
IntCont	Interpolations and First Continuation of ChronE (Irvine)
ChronNor2	Northern annals in 1064 x 1080 in ChronD (Cubbin) and ChronE (Irvine)
ChronWorc	Annals in ChronD (Cubbin) covering the 1050s
*Gl (Ru)	Owun's glosses to the Rushworth Gospels
LawGepyncðo(H)	Version of the tract LawGepyncðo in the <i>Textus Roffensis</i> (Rochester, Diocesan Registry, s.n.), ed. by Liebermann (1903–16)
WÆLet 2	Wulfstan's version of Ælfric's first pastoral letter to him in Old English, ed. by Fehr (1966)
WCorp	Corpus of texts attributed to Archbishop Wulfstan II of York

\* Please note that the abbreviations of the titles of Old English texts in this book generally follow those provided by the *OEC*. This section only records the abbreviations which are not included in the *OEC* (mainly because the abbreviation used here refers to a small group of texts, e.g. Ch Æ), or differ in some respect from those used in the *OEC* (again, mainly because a group of texts which are treated separately in the *OEC* are here discussed together, e.g. \*Gl [Ru]).

**Latin**

ECf	<i>Leges Edwardi Confessoris</i> , ed. by O'Brien (1999)
ESS	Domesday Book for Essex, ed. by Rumble (1983)
LawWlArt	The 'Ten Articles' by William the Conqueror, ed. by Liebermann (1903–16)
LIN	Domesday Book for Lincolnshire, ed. by Morgan and Thorn (1986)
S *	Charters studied by Sawyer (1968) which are not included in the <i>OEC</i>
WIL	Domesday Book for Wiltshire, ed. by Thorn (1979)
YKS	Domesday Book for Yorkshire, ed. by Faull and Stinson (1986)

**Old Norse**

Æ	'Ærfpæ balker' (inheritance section) in an Old Swedish law-code
DR	<i>Danmarks runeindskrifter</i> , ed. by Jacobson and Moltke (1941–42)
ESjL	Erik's Zealandic Law, ed. by Brøndum-Nielsen and others (1933–61)
G	<i>Medan världen vakar: Studier i de gotländska runinskrifternas språk och kronologi</i> , ed. by Snædal (2002)
Gul.	Law of the Gulathing, included in <i>NGL</i>
Frost.	Law of the Frostathing, included in <i>NGL</i>
IR	<i>The Runic Inscriptions of Viking Age Dublin</i> , by Barnes and others (1997)
JL	Jutish Law, ed. by Brøndum-Nielsen and others (1933–61)
Jn.	<i>Járnsíða</i> , included in <i>NGL</i>
Ku.	'Kunungs balker' ('king's section') in an Old Swedish law-code
<i>NGL</i>	<i>Norges gamle love indtil 1387</i> , ed. by Keyser and others (1846–95)
Ög.	<i>Östergötlands runinskrifter</i> , ed. by Brate (1911–18)
Öl.	<i>Ölands runinskrifter</i> , ed. by Söderberg and Brate (1900–06)
SkL	Law of Scania, ed. by Brøndum-Nielsen and others (1933–61)
Sm.	<i>Smålands runinskrifter</i> , ed. by Kinander (1935–61)
Sö.	<i>Södermanlands runinskrifter</i> , ed. by Brate and Wessén (1924–36)
U	<i>Upplands runinskrifter</i> , ed. by Wessén and Jansson (1940–59)
UL	Law of Uppland, ed. by Schlyter and Collin (1827–77)
Vg.	<i>Västergötlands runinskrifter</i> , ed. by Jungner and Svärdström (1940–71)
VmL	Law of Västmanland, ed. by Schlyter and Collin (1827–77)
Vs.	<i>Västmanlands runinskrifter</i> , ed. by Jansson (1974)

*Latin Abbreviations*

c.	approximately (of dates; L <i>circa</i> )
cp.	compare (L <i>compara</i> )
cf.	contrast (L <i>confer</i> )
e.g.	for instance (L <i>exempli gratia</i> )
etc.	and other things (L <i>et cetera</i> )
ff.	and on succeeding pages (L <i>foliis</i> )
fl.	flourished (of people; L <i>floruit</i> )
fol.	page (of a manuscript; L <i>folio</i> )
fols	pages (of a manuscript; L <i>foliis</i> )
id.	the same (meaning; L <i>idem</i> )
i.e.	that is (L <i>id est</i> )
no.	number (L <i>numero</i> )
r	face of a manuscript page (L <i>recto</i> )
r.	ruled (L <i>rexist</i> )
s.	century (L <i>saeculo</i> )
s.a.	under the year (of annals; L <i>sub anno</i> )
s.v.	under the word (in a dictionary; L <i>sub verbo</i> )
s.vv.	under the words (in a dictionary; L <i>sub verbis</i> )
v	back of a manuscript page (L <i>verso</i> )
viz.	namely (L <i>videlicet</i> )
vs	against (L <i>versus</i> )

*Symbols*

<	derives from
>	develops into
//	phonological transcription
[ ]	phonetic transcription
< >	spelling
{ }	spurious documents (and documents whose language has been somewhat altered) associated with a king's secretariat
*	unattested form





## INTRODUCTION

### *1.1. Scope of the Study*

It has long been recognized that the intimate fusion of Old English and Old Norse, particularly in the areas settled by the Scandinavian newcomers, left a deep impact on the English lexicon, not so much in terms of the number of loans but mainly in connection with their non-technical character, which differentiates them from French and Latin loans. However, the Norse-derived terms first recorded during the Middle English period have received more attention than those already attested in Old English texts, probably because of their larger number and, generally speaking, their being everyday terms rather than belonging to specific technolects, a feature that characterizes most (although by no means all) of the Norse-derived terms first recorded during the Old English period.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, most of the studies which have explored in the past the Norse-derived terms already recorded in Old English texts present their discussion mainly in list format, focusing on etymological discussions (which heavily rely on previous studies), and not dealing with the assimilation of the terms into the Old English lexicon in much detail (see further below, 1.3.2 and 1.4). This study attempts to palliate these problems by, firstly, reviewing the list of terms attested during the Old English period for which Norse derivation can be claimed and, secondly, studying the process of integration of the terms in Old English by analysing, as far as possible, the chronological and dialectal distribution of the terms, and the semantic and stylistic relationships which the terms had with native (near)synonyms. It is only by engaging in these issues that we can gain a detailed and nuanced perspective of the Anglo-Scandinavian socio-linguistic relations.

<sup>1</sup> On how to interpret the composite adjective *Norse-derived*, see below, 1.2.

Given that an electronic corpus of Anglo-Latin texts composed during the Old English period does not exist, this study is restricted to the analysis of texts which were written in Old English, i.e. texts which are part of the *OEC*.<sup>2</sup> However, not all the texts included in the *OEC* are discussed in the main body of this study. The *OEC* includes some texts which are generally associated with the Early Middle English period, and these are discussed in Appendix IV instead. Thus, that appendix deals with the (possibly) Norse-derived terms in the texts which are included in the *OEC* and, at the same time, are presented by Laing (Laing 1993) as sources scholars can rely on for the compilation of *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English 1150–1325*.

Moreover, not all the terms attested in Old English texts clearly composed during the Old English period are analysed here. On the one hand, this book does not deal with the Norse-derived terms recorded in the description of Scandinavia inserted in the Old English translation of Orosius's *Historiarum adversum paganos libri septem*. Even though the identity of the sources for the Scandinavian section has been subjected to differing opinions, it is now commonly accepted that the information originated from a Norwegian tradesman talking to King Alfred about his homeland (i.e. Ohthere) and an Anglo-Saxon tradesman referring to place- and people-names which he would have learnt during his travels to the lands he describes (i.e. Wulfstan). Although we cannot be certain about the language Ohthere spoke in, the possibility that he used his mother tongue when addressing the Alfredian court seems very likely in light of the Norse-derived terms recorded in his account (see Townend 2002:

<sup>2</sup> Most of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Latin texts written during the Old English period are also recorded in Old English texts. Some exceptions include the expression 'iaceat in ungildan ækre' (cp. OIc *liggi i úgildum akri* 'shall lie in an unatoned grave') in LawIVatr 4 (on which see Hofmann 1955: §266; see also below, III.4.UUU); the administrative term referring to a subdivision of a wapentake *treding* / *trething* (cp. OE \**ðrīðing* or \**ðrīding*, cp. OIc *þrīðjungr* 'third part'; see Steenstrup 1882: 75–76, Kisbye 1982b: 64, Peters 1981: 98, Roffe 1990, and O'Brien 1999: 188–91 and 276 n. 109); and the compound *bātswegen* 'boatman' (cp. OE *bāt* 'boat' and OIc *sveinn* 'boy, servant'), which is only recorded as a by-name as far as Old English texts are concerned (see Rec 10.6.4 (Earle) 28.5), while its attestation as a common noun during the Anglo-Saxon period is restricted to Latin sources (see Björkman 1910: 139–40 and 178, and Tengvik 1938: 199 and 238). The spellings and meanings of Old English terms follow, in general, those provided by the *DOE* for the terms starting in any letter from *a* to *g*, and Clark Hall 1960 for the others. Yet slight alterations to the translations based on external evidence are sometimes silently introduced (as in the case of OE *ōra*, which Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *ōra*, translates as 'a coin of Danish origin'; see below, 2.2.1.2.C). The spellings and meanings of Old Icelandic terms follow those provided by Cleasby and Vigfusson 1957.

90–95). The present monograph is concerned with Norse-derived terms which would have been familiar at least in some circles in Anglo-Saxon England, and the Norse-derived terms in Ohthere's account and the place- and people-names in both accounts, albeit very useful when discussing the intelligibility between speakers of Old English and Old Norse, do not fully fit the purposes of this book. These terms or the effects of the Norse influence on them, with the exception of OE *unfrið* and *cyrstel* (on which see below III.3.1.B and III.4.K), are not recorded outside the Old English Orosius, which suggests that they can be understood as nonce words arising out of one particular communicative situation (cp. OE *carlfugol* and *cwenfugol*; see below, 3.4.2.8.A.1). The readers interested in these terms are directed to Townend's thorough analysis (Townend 2002: 96–109; cp. Fell 1984a and Bately 2006; see also below, 2.2.1.1).<sup>3</sup>

Similarly, this book will only consider personal names, by-names, and place-names in so much as they elucidate the terms dealt with in this study; however, a detailed analysis of the onomastic material per se lies outside the scope of the present work. For a general study of the Scandinavian personal names recorded in Old English, the reader can turn to Björkman's 1910 book and Lehisté's 1958 article, while the Scandinavian by-names have been studied by Tengvik (Tengvik 1938). The Norse-derived elements recorded in place-names have been analysed, among others, by Smith (A. H. Smith 1970) and are currently being revised as part of the *VEPN*.

## 1.2. Some Notes on Terminology

As explained by the *OED* (*OED* 2000–: s.v. *Norse*), the term *Norse* is an early Modern English borrowing from Du. *noors* 'Norwegian', which was probably a variant of Du. *noords* 'northern'. In its strictest and earliest sense, *Norse* refers to the language spoken in Norway; thus, *Old Norse* can be applied to the dialects spoken in Norway and its North Atlantic colonies during the Viking Age.

<sup>3</sup> The terms discussed by Townend (Townend 2002) which are not place- or personal names are listed here for the sake of completion: OE *ædele* 'noble (of people)' used instead with the meaning 'best, foremost (of inanimate objects)' (cp. OIc *adal* 'foremost, most important'; but see Bately 2006); OE *easteward* 'eastward, east' used in opposition to OE *nordeweard* 'northward, north' instead of the expected OE *sudeweard* 'southward, south' (cp. OIc *austr* 'east', commonly used in the phrase OIc *austr i Vik*, which refers to the area around the Oslo Fjord between Gautelven and Rygjarbit); OE *horshwal* 'walrus' (cp. OIc *brosshvalr* 'walrus' and *romshvalr* id.); OE *hrān* 'reindeer' and *stalhrān* 'decoy-reindeer' (cp. OIc *breinn* 'reindeer'); and OE *(ge)siglan* 'to sail' instead of the more common OE *(ge)seglan* (cp. OIc *sigla* 'to sail').

However, in studies dealing with the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact during the Viking Age it is very common to use the term to refer in general to the language of the Scandinavian newcomers, regardless of whether they came from the areas which nowadays belong to Norway, Denmark, Sweden, etc. (cp. OIc *dǫnsk tunga* and MnNw. *norrønt*). This is the sense of the term in this book. When dialectal differences have to be pointed out, the phrases *Old West Norse* and *Old East Norse* are introduced. Given that, except for runic inscriptions, Old Norse did not start to be written down until after the Viking Age and that most of the earliest texts come from Iceland (see the contributions to section X in Bandle and others 2002–05: 1; see further below, 1.6.1), it is standard to cite Old Icelandic forms as representative of Old Norse and this is again the practice followed in this book. Needless to say, this practice is fully artificial, though, not only because of the existence of dialectal differences already during the Viking Age (see further below, 1.6.2.1), but also because these terms were only written down after the Viking Age and could therefore have changed over time. In cases when the form spoken during the Viking Age is specifically mentioned, either through a reconstruction or through an attestation on a runic inscription, the phrase *Viking Age Norse* is used.

Once the term *Old Norse* as understood in this book has been defined, it is important to clarify what the composite adjective *Norse-derived* refers to. In order to do so, we need to take a side-step first and discuss the classification of loans followed in this study. Fischer (A. Fischer 2003) explains that there are three main options when looking at borrowing:

- (1) to focus on the morphological structure and the etymology of the loans;
- (2) to focus on the lexical and semantic consequences of borrowing; and
- (3) to focus on socio-historical issues so as to classify the contact situations and their effects on borrowing.

The classification of the different types of loans followed here is in keeping with the first option. Amongst the typologies associated with it, the present study follows Haugen's not only because of its clarity but also because it goes back to his study of Norwegian loans in American English and is, therefore, fully appropriate for the topic of the present work (Haugen 1950a). Haugen distinguishes the following types of loans (Haugen 1950a: 214–15):

- (1) *loan-words*, which 'show morphemic importation without substitution' (e.g. OE *lagu* 'law', a term borrowed from the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *log* 'law'; see below, 2.4.1.E);
- (2) *loan-blends*, which 'show morphemic substitution as well as importation'

(e.g. OE *fēolaga* ‘business partner’, a compound borrowed from the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *fēlagi* ‘business partner’, but with OE *fēoh* ‘cattle, property’ as the determinant; see below, 2.4.2.I);

- (3) *loan-shifts*, which ‘show morphemic substitution without importation’ and which include *loan translations* (e.g. OE *drincelēan*, a compound of uncertain meaning formed on the basis of OWN *drekkulaun* ‘reward from drink’ with OE *drinc* ‘drink’ and *lēan* ‘reward, gift’; see below, 2.5.G) and *semantic loans* (e.g. the meaning ‘to accuse, make a claim against’ for OE *cwyddian*, which seems to have developed under the influence of the Viking Age Norse verb represented by OIc *kveðja* ‘to call on, summon’; see below, 2.5.F).

Particular care has to be taken to distinguish loan-blends from what Haugen calls *hybrid creations*, i.e. terms which are formed on the basis of borrowed material but whose creation is the result of an independent process in the borrowing language (Haugen 1950a: 221). Instead of *hybrid creations*, the present study uses the term *new formations* because it also includes compounds such as OE *grīðlagu* ‘law of temporary or local peace’, which is formed by the Norse-derived loan-words *grīð* and *lagu* but does not rely on an Old Norse model (see further below, 2.4.1.E and 2.5.I). The adjective *Norse-derived*, then, refers in this book to both Old Norse loans and new formations which have a loan as a base (in a derivative) or as (at least) one of the lexemes (in a compound).<sup>4</sup> In using this composite adjective, the present work follows Dance’s terminology (Dance 2003 and Dance 2011).<sup>5</sup>

### *1.3. Background of the Study I: The Scandinavians in England and their Linguistic Impact*

In order to understand the different nature of the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact in various dialectal varieties and at different chronological points it is important to bear in mind the complex character of that contact. Similarly, an appreciation of the significance of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Old

<sup>4</sup> When no distinction is intended between a derivative and a compound, the term *complex* is used; on this terminology, see Bauer 1983: 28–30.

<sup>5</sup> On the term *Norse-derived*, see also Durkin, who praises the adjective on the basis that it does not imply that the terms have been borrowed directly as a result of Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact, but accounts instead for the fact that many terms spread through interdialectal contact (see further below, Chapter 3) (Durkin 2009: 141). I am very thankful to Dr Richard Dance for having allowed me to have access to his 2011 paper before its publication.

English for the history of the English language would be facilitated by a general understanding of the influence that the contact between Old English and Old Norse speakers had on its development. This section will provide an overview (albeit a very limited one due to spatial limitations) of these two issues.

### 1.3.1. The Scandinavian Presence in England

When considering Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contacts it is worth bearing in mind that the Germanic tribes who settled in Britain, whose linguistic varieties would later on give rise to Old English, might have included some speakers of North Germanic dialects; this could explain some of the linguistic features that bring the Anglian varieties of Old English close to Old Norse (see below, Chapter 2). Furthermore, archaeological data could be taken as evidence that there existed some trade exchanges in the post-migration but pre-Viking Age period between Britain and Scandinavia, which might have continued exposure to North Germanic / Old Norse linguistic varieties (see Hines 1984). However, as Townend points out, ‘not even a best-case scenario permits belief in an Anglo-Scandinavian intimacy sufficient to prevent or limit linguistic divergence between the two speech communities; for the Anglo-Saxons, seventh- and eighth-century contact can have meant, at most, only the familiarity of Norse speech to a few coastal areas’ (Townend 2002: 31). Yet we need to bear in mind that it might actually be the case that some of the effects that we attribute to Viking Age Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact should actually be studied as belonging to an earlier state of affairs (see below, 2.1).

In any case, we should look at the end of the eighth century, when the first Scandinavian attacks on English lands took place, as the beginning of a new era of Anglo-Scandinavian contact. This era is commonly divided into three phases (see further Keynes 1997 and Keynes 2007, with references, for more detailed information about these historical events):

- (1) From the end of the eighth century, the first attack having taken place in 787, to the middle of the ninth century, the Scandinavian activities in England were characterized by hit-and-run attacks.
- (2) While their initial activities in England had in the main been limited to summer plunders, from the middle of the ninth century the Scandinavians started to spend their winters on English soil, turning their attention to conquest rather than mere pillage. Thus, a ‘great heathen army’ took control of East Anglia in 865 and York in 866, and forayed into Mercia in 867. The most important dates of this period are 878, when King Alfred the

Great and Guthrum, the leader of the Scandinavian army that had tried to conquer Wessex in 875, signed the Treaty of Wedmore, establishing the border of the area where the Scandinavians were allowed to settle down (commonly referred to as the *Danelaw*) as a line which, generally speaking, stretched from London to Chester (see further R. H. C. Davis 1991, Dumville 1992b, and Kershaw 2000), and 954, when King Eadred took control over York after Eric Bloodaxe's expulsion and, in so doing, gained the last of the English territories dominated by the Scandinavians.

- (3) A third phase, characterized by political domination, began with Svein's activities; his priorities changed at some point between 1007 and 1013 from the extraction of tribute (or Danegeld) to conquest. His aim was to seize royal power rather than mere settlement, an aim that was particularly achieved by his son Cnut (r. 1016–35), who made England part of a powerful Scandinavian empire (on Cnut's reign, see further Lawson 1993 and Bolton 2009, with references). Although Harald Hardrada attempted to follow on Cnut's steps in 1066 after Edward the Confessor's death, and the last of the Viking Age Scandinavian attacks took place in 1085, the third phase can be said to end with the death of Harthacnut, Cnut's son, in 1042.

It is important to distinguish between these phases not only from a historical perspective but also in connection with the linguistic impact that the varying circumstances had on the English language. The erratic character of the attacks during the first phase probably only allowed for very limited linguistic contact, in connection with both communication time and topics dealt with. Thus, Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contacts flourished mainly during the second and third phases. While the two phases probably saw the more or less continuous arrival of Old Norse speakers from Scandinavia (settlers, traders, fighters, etc.; see, for instance, Williams 1986), they can be said to diverge in connection with the areas of significant Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact. During the second phase, linguistic contact between the speakers of Old English and Old Norse probably took place mainly in the areas settled by the Scandinavian newcomers, whereas Cnut's royal power facilitated the presence of Old Norse speakers in areas where it had previously been insignificant (e.g. in the South-West Midlands and the South-East; see Holman 1996: 17–19). This process, however, probably involved many fewer Old Norse speakers than those who took part in the ninth-century settlement. Thus, this type of Anglo-Scandinavian contact may explain particular linguistic uses, in connection with changes arising from royal policies and linguistic practices (see, for instance, below, 3.4.2.6.A.4, 3.4.2.4.A, and 3.4.2.3.A) or with the lexical choices in specific texts



(see below, 4.2.1; see also 3.4.2.2.E.2 and II.189); yet it was probably much less influential than that developed in the areas of Scandinavian settlement.

There are two issues that need to be borne in mind as far as the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact arising from the settlement of the Scandinavian newcomers in particular areas of England is concerned. On the one hand, the number of Scandinavian settlers is a hotly debated topic. Following Weinreich's view that 'even for extensive word transferring, large numbers of bilingual speakers need not be involved and the relative size of the groups is not necessarily a factor' (Weinreich 1963: 92), some scholars (e.g. Sawyer in P. Sawyer and others 1969) believe that the settlement included only a very limited, albeit highly influential, number of people. Yet, on the basis of the significant impact of Old Norse lexical practices on various levels of linguistic analysis (see below, 1.3.2) and the great diversity of Norse-derived personal names in England, others (e.g. Lund in P. Sawyer and others 1969, and Abrams and Parsons 2004) believe the process to have involved much larger numbers (see further Hansen 1984 and Trafford 2000).

While this debate may never be settled, most scholars would agree that the number of Old Norse speakers within the Danelaw did vary significantly. Samuels calls the 'Great Scandinavian Belt' the area 'stretching from Cumberland and Westmorland in the west to the North and East Ridings of Yorkshire in the east, often including part of Lincolnshire but excluding the old kingdom of Bernicia in Durham and Northumberland' (Samuels 1989: 106). This area with very significant Scandinavian presence comprises part of the Northern Danelaw (on which see further Hadley 2000b) and part of the so-called Five Boroughs, viz. Leicester, Derby, Lincoln, Nottingham, and Stamford (on which see further Stafford 1985: ch. 7). It is here, in the 'Great Scandinavian Belt' and the Five Boroughs, that the concentration of Scandinavian newcomers was heaviest; however, there are also other areas, such as to the north of the 'Great Scandinavian Belt' and what Hart calls the 'Eastern Danelaw' (Norfolk and Suffolk), the 'Outer Danelaw' (Bedford, Huntingdon, Cambridge, and Northampton), and to a much lesser extent the 'Southern Danelaw' (the later shires of Buckinghamshire, Middlesex, Hertfordshire, and Essex), where there also seem to have been enough Old Norse speakers to leave a significant mark on the local linguistic variety (Hart 1992: ch. 1).<sup>6</sup> While

<sup>6</sup> For a recent overview of the settlement of the Scandinavian newcomers in England, see Hadley 2006: chs 3 and 4. More specific references to Scandinavian presence can be found later in the book, in contexts where particular relevant areas are discussed (e.g. 4.2.3–4). On the presence of Scandinavian newcomers from different areas, see below, 1.6.2.1.



intermarriage may have been prominent throughout all the areas populated by the Scandinavians,<sup>7</sup> it is likely to have been the case that the newcomers who settled in areas with sparser Scandinavian presence established more and more varied sociolinguistic links with the local population than those living in heavily Scandinavianized areas, leading them to an earlier Anglicization in all aspects, including their language. These differing situations are likely to have been accompanied by different levels of linguistic influence. Thus, the varied nature of the population make-up may explain some linguistic features that are otherwise difficult to account for, such as the significant presence of Norse-derived terms in a relatively early text originating from an area with some, albeit not heavy, Scandinavian influence (see below, 4.2.3).

### 1.3.2. The Impact of Old Norse on English

As we would expect from a situation of linguistic contact involving very close languages, the results of the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact are mainly visible in, although by no means limited to, the lexical level of linguistic analysis. The significance of Norse-derived terms in English does not lie in their number, Latin- and French-derived terms being much more numerous, but in their character.<sup>8</sup> While the Romance terms are in the main technical terms and terms associated with more formal registers,<sup>9</sup> the Norse-derived vocabulary comprises a majority of basic, non-technical terms, although there is a signifi-

<sup>7</sup> Linguistic and archaeological evidence (see Speed and Rogers 2004, Hadley 2006: 244–45, and Jesch 2008) is indicative of the presence of some Scandinavian women in England; however, there is no clear evidence to suggest that they came to England in very large numbers.

<sup>8</sup> Hug calculates that Norse-derived terms account for approximately 2 per cent of the vocabulary of standard Present-Day English (Hug 1987: 1). Nielsen (Nielsen 1998a: 181) prefers to provide a numerical estimate; he calculates that there are between six hundred and nine hundred Norse-derived terms in the standard language, although he admits that, if the list were to be restricted to words whose Norse origin is absolutely certain, the number would probably not exceed six hundred. The number of Norse-derived terms would, needless to say, increase significantly if dialectal terms were also taken into consideration; thus, Denison and Hogg count approximately 1500 words of Norse origin in the *OED* (Denison and Hogg 2006: 2; cp. Flom 1900, Thorson 1936, and Kries 2003).

<sup>9</sup> Not all Romance terms in English have a technical character, though; see, for instance, Iglesias Rábade 1991. See also Lutz 2012a and Lutz 2012b for an argument in favour of considering French and Norse influences on English much more comparable than is commonly accepted; I am very thankful to Prof. Angelika Lutz for having sent me a copy of her work before its publication.

cant difference between the terms first attested during the Old English period and those first recorded in Middle English texts: given the sociolinguistic relationship between Old Norse and Old English speakers (with some periods of political domination by Old Norse speakers), the changes in the sociolinguistic dynamics introduced by the Norman Conquest, when Anglo-Norman French took over as the most prestigious language in a clearly diglossic situation, and the fact that we have access to Middle English texts produced in heavily Scandinavianized areas hardly represented by the extant Old English texts (see below, 1.6.1), it is not surprising that, while the Norse-derived terms recorded in Old English texts include a majority of technical terms, the opposite is the case as far as the Middle English period is concerned (see further below, 3.2.1 and Appendix IV).<sup>10</sup>

Besides lexical items, though, the Norse-derived terms also include grammatical terms, such as the personal pronoun *they* (cp. OIc *þeir*),<sup>11</sup> the preposition *till* (cp. OIc *til*; see below, IV.2.3.2.G) or the conjunction *though* (cp. OIc *þó*; see below, IV.2.1.P). The fact that the Old Norse influence permeated not only the open-ended categories (nouns, adjectives, verbs, and adverbs) but also the closed categories, which may be a testament to the closeness of the two languages (see further below, 1.6.2.2), cannot be forgotten when assessing the significant impact that Norse-derived vocabulary had on English.

The impact of Old Norse on English phonology is mainly limited to the pronunciation of particular words (e.g. /g/ instead of /j/ in PDE *give*, and, possibly, the development of the personal pronoun *she*; see the *OED* 1989: s.v. *give*, v., and *she*, and below, IV.3.Q) rather than the development of new phonemes (but see also Danchev 1986). Its influence at the morphosyntactic level appears to have been much more important. English underwent many changes from the Old to the Middle English period, the most significant ones being the dramatic simplification of nominal inflectional endings and, closely connected with this, the loss of grammatical gender and the change from an OV to a VO

<sup>10</sup> Unfortunately, there is not a comprehensive study of all the Norse-derived terms recorded in Middle English; however, interested readers can turn to Brate 1884, Björkman 1900–02: 66 (see below, 1.4), Rynell 1948, Hug 1987, Dance 2003, Dance 2011, Dance forthcoming a, and Dance 2013. I am very thankful to Dr Richard Dance for having allowed me to have access to his forthcoming papers. For a short overview of the reasons behind the borrowing of technical and non-technical vocabulary, see Haspelmath 2009: 46–50.

<sup>11</sup> On the factors that might have led to the introduction and spread of the Norse-derived pronoun in English, see Werner 1991, Morse-Gagné 2003, and Ritt 2003. See also below, III.1.1.A.

language. The facts that some of these features are similar to those exhibited by creole languages and that the texts originating from the non-Scandinavianized areas tend to be much more conservative in their inflectional morphology than those from the areas where the Scandinavians settled down (e.g. the inscription on the Aldbrough sundial, viz. Inscr 1 (Ok 1); see below, Chapter 5) have led some scholars to suggest that Middle English, particularly the varieties heavily influenced by Old Norse, should be treated as a type of creole (e.g. Dominique 1977, Poussa 1982, and McWhorter 2002).<sup>12</sup> Although the analysis of this suggestion falls outside the margins of this study, it is important to point out that, while the creolization hypothesis is not widely accepted (see Görlach 1986, Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 263–331, and Danchev 1997), the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact is generally perceived to have been an important (albeit by no means the only) factor in these changes (see for instance, Allen 1997b, Kroch and Taylor 1997, Millar 1997a, Trips 2002, and D. G. Miller 2012: ch. 5).<sup>13</sup>

Seen within the wider context of the linguistic aspects where we can identify Old Norse influence on English, the Norse-derived terms first recorded during the Old English period might seem somewhat unimportant because they tend to represent the types of lexical items which are most easily borrowed (see below, 3.2.1): as noted above, most of them have a technical character and many of them are (at least initially) associated with the Scandinavian culture, and hence appear to have been borrowed because of the need to refer to something new or to emphasize its foreign connections. However, we need to bear in mind that the aforementioned features do not apply to all the terms first attested during the Old English period. There are already many non-technical terms which had native (near)synonyms, technical terms which, despite having started their lives as pointers of the Scandinavian culture, soon lost such cultural connections and became deeply integrated in the Old English lexicon, at least as far as the idiolect of particular individuals was concerned, due to their usefulness to express particular concepts more clearly (see, for instance, below, 3.4.2.2.A and 3.4.2.6.A.1), and even, probably, some grammatical terms (see below, 3.2.2). The terms first recorded in Old English texts, then, show already some of the features that make Norse-derived vocabulary so interesting

<sup>12</sup> For suggestions that Middle English might be a creole language as a result of French influence instead, see, for instance, Bailey and Maroldt 1977.

<sup>13</sup> For further summaries of the debate, see Dance 2012, with references. I am very thankful to Dr Richard Dance for having allowed me to read this article before its publication, and to Prof. D. Gary Miller for having shared with me the contents of his book before its publication.

and important for the history of the English language. Furthermore, the study of Old English texts is fundamental because they are closest to the main period of Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact, and hence can provide us with valuable information about the varying character of (possibly) near-contemporary Anglo-Scandinavian relationships, as well as the factors that may have contributed to the adoption and integration in the English lexicon of terms which are still in use nowadays. It is therefore regrettable that, as the next section indicates, these issues have not been explored in detail by previous scholars.

#### *1.4. Background of the Study II: The Scholarly Tradition*

Due to the large number of works devoted to the analysis of Norse-derived vocabulary in English, this section focuses on some of the ground-breaking publications which are particularly important for the study of the terms attested during the Old English period.

The presence of Norse-derived vocabulary in English has long been noted and studied. In 1876 Skeat published *A List of English Words, the Etymology of which Is Illustrated by Comparison with Icelandic* (cp. Hjort 1843), which was intended as an appendix for the first edition of Cleasby and Vigfusson's *Icelandic-English Dictionary*. In this work Skeat did not differentiate between cognates and loans, partially because he believed the state of English etymology at the time to be such that 'all haste, over-confidence, and dogmatism' had to be avoided (Skeat 1876: iv). He made the distinction clear, however, in the 1882 edition of his *Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language*, where he identified approximately six hundred terms to be Norse-derived. Many of those etymological explanations have since been shown to be incorrect, though, and an alternative etymon, frequently from Dutch or German, has been suggested. Geipel presents this case as an example of the fact that, once the presence of Norse-derived terms in English was recognized, 'etymologists tended, in their zeal, to identify rather more than actually existed' (Geipel 1971: 69). Unfortunately, that tendency does not seem to be over yet (see Appendix III).

The year 1882 also saw the publication of the fourth part of Steenstrup's *Normannerne*, which dealt with the settlement of the Scandinavian newcomers in England during the ninth and tenth centuries and the impact which it had not only on English legislation, navigation, warfare, etc., but also on the language itself. Björkman describes Steenstrup's work, which superseded previous studies by Worsæ (Worsæ 1851 and Worsæ 1863), as 'the first work of importance' on the Norse-derived terms in English (Björkman 1900–02: 1). Steenstrup's work was followed by Brate's detailed study of the Norse-derived

terms in the early Middle English text *Ormulum* (Brate 1884). As noted by Björkman, the significance of this work lies not only in its content but also in its methodology, because it is based on philological rather than historical principles, as is the case in Steenstrup's volume (Björkman 1900–02: 1–2). Steenstrup's and Brate's works were the basis for Kluge's 1891 study of Norse-derived terms as part of an article on the history of English. The article underwent much revision and expansion for the second edition of the volume where it was included, published in 1901; in the revised version Kluge included a list of approximately one hundred and fifty terms attested before the middle of the twelfth century. Much more importantly, the turn of the twentieth century also saw the publication of Björkman's own seminal work on the Norse-derived terms attested in Middle English (Björkman 1900–02), a work which is of great significance as well for those interested in studying the terms already attested during the Old English period. Björkman's analysis follows on the steps of Brate's philological work; it attempts to classify the terms according to various levels of certainty over their Norse derivation on the basis of the type of evidence one can rely on when making such claims (phonological, morphological, cultural, textual, etc.).

It took more than fifty years for a work on Norse-derived terms attested in Old English to mirror the level of detail and chronological spread of Björkman's work. Such work was Hofmann's 1955 analysis of the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact during the Viking Age and its impact on the two languages involved. Hofmann's systematic study can be clearly seen to be the basis for Peters's list of Norse-derived terms attested in Old English texts (Peters 1981). Peters's work is, in its turn, the starting point for Wollmann's study of the terms attested in Old English (particularly in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*) and the phonological processes involved in the integration of the loan-words (Wollmann 1996).

As the previous lines suggest, there is a strong tradition for scholars to rely closely on their predecessors; while this is a central part of scholarly practice, it means that the Norse derivation of various terms is repeated time and again without being duly questioned and reasserted. Consequently, there is great need to revise the list of terms which have traditionally been suggested to be Norse-derived. Similarly, the studies tend to be concerned with presenting lists of words; thus, the terms are not commonly studied in their textual context and it is hard to find works where the terms are compared and contrasted with the other members of their lexico-semantic fields. Recent works provide important, albeit limited in scope, exceptions in this respect: A. Fischer 1989,

McKinney 1994, and Pons-Sanz 2007b. In this respect, and as Dance points out,

there is still a fundamental need to return to the study of the words themselves, their etymologies and forms (phonological / orthographic and morphological), and their semantic and stylistic nuances within the textual traditions in which they are recorded, if we really hope to understand the factors that underlie their acceptance, use and spread. (Dance 2004: 6)

Townend lists some of the questions that can and should be asked when the presence of a term in a text is seen 'as the result of variation or choice conditioned by sociolinguistic factors, and related to literary register as well as dialect geography': 'Why should these Norse-derived loans occur in this particular text? What is their status? Are they still perceived as foreign words or phrases, or are their origins forgotten so that they function and develop like long-established native words?' (Townend 2000b: 92). These are the questions that the present work tries to address in order to understand how the terms function in their texts.

### *1.5. The Structure of this Book*

In Chapter 2 the reader will find a very detailed analysis of the evidence scholars have for the identification of particular terms recorded during the Old English period as Norse-derived; the chapter discusses only the terms which are here accepted as being Norse-derived, either definitely or, at least, probably. This study disagrees on many occasions with previous works about the probability of Norse derivation of particular terms; those words which have previously been suggested to be Norse-derived but whose native origin is here considered to be more likely on the basis of the available evidence are discussed instead in Appendix III.

Chapter 3 presents a lexico-semantic analysis of the terms discussed in Chapter 2. It consists of two main parts. The first part reviews the terms' chronological and dialectal distribution in an attempt to establish differences in the Norse-derived vocabulary recorded in various Old English dialects and at different times. The information presented here relies very heavily on Appendix I, which records all the occurrences of the (accepted) Norse-derived terms in Old English texts, and Appendix II, which explains what is currently known about the chronological and dialectal origin of the texts where the terms are recorded. Admittedly, there are still very significant gaps in our knowledge of textual origin, and the extant texts seem to give prominence to late West Saxon

over the other Old English dialects (see further below, 1.6.1). However, it is fundamental to analyse the distribution of the terms as far as we can in order to establish those whose use spread outside the areas of Scandinavian settlement. That spread can sometimes be accounted for by looking at the position of the Norse-derived terms in their lexico-semantic fields, and trying to identify as far as possible the semantic and stylistic relationships between these terms and their native (near)synonyms. In doing so and in establishing in some cases the cultural history of the terms, the second part of this chapter helps to explain how and why some of the terms became very popular already during the Old English period (to the extent that, in some cases, they became the core members of their lexico-semantic field).

Chapter 4 continues to focus on the Norse-derived terms in context, but this time their context is the text where they are recorded. This chapter continues a long tradition of using lexical data in order to establish the dialectal area where a text might have been composed or the specific person it may be attributable to. As in many previous studies, definite conclusions are not always possible; however, it is important to engage in this activity in order to identify the problems that scholars encounter when following this line of enquiry.

Given the very large number of terms discussed in this work, it is difficult to reach very broad generalizing conclusions, although Chapter 5 brings the findings from the rest of the book together and, in doing so, does outline important issues concerning the distribution of the terms in Old English, the factors that might have contributed to that distribution, and what this may tell us about the sociolinguistic situation of late Anglo-Saxon and early Anglo-Norman England. It is, however, necessary to move from these general points to the individual words, because each of them involves different problems in its etymology, has a different distribution, as well different relationships with the members of its lexico-semantic field, and, therefore, can tell us a different story. After all, the lexicon of a language is made up by individual words and that individuality is fully appreciated in this book.

Finally, Appendix IV discusses the Norse derivation of terms recorded in texts which might be better described as early Middle English rather than Old English, although, admittedly, the separation between the two periods remains very problematic, as recent work conducted by Elaine Treharne, Mary Swan, and Orietta Da Rold as part of the AHRC-funded project *The Production and Use of English Manuscripts 1060 to 1220* clearly shows.<sup>14</sup> As in Chapter 2 and

<sup>14</sup> See <<http://www.le.ac.uk/english/em1060to1220/index.html>> [accessed 22 November



Appendix III, the terms are discussed in connection with the evidence which is the strongest indicator of their (possible) Norse derivation.

## 1.6. *Some Problems Facing this Study*

### 1.6.1. Scandinavian and English Sources

A study involving the issues outlined above, 1.1 and 1.5, faces a significant number of problems, which are in many cases interconnected. As pointed out in 1.2, our records of Old Norse do not, in the main, come from the period of the linguistic contact itself, which complicates our knowledge of Viking Age Norse. Würth (Würth 2002, with references) has recently summarized the sources we can rely on to study the transitional period between what has been termed, amongst other names, North-West Germanic (Antonsen 1975, Antonsen 1994; see also Nielsen 1998b) or Early Runic (Nielsen 2000), and the earliest written attestations of Old Norse, i.e. the period which would stretch (approximately) from the sixth to the twelfth centuries. These sources include place-names and personal names, texts in foreign languages which record Norse loan-words as well as Norse names, literary documents, and, most importantly, runic inscriptions (cp. Barnes 1993). The foreign texts recording Norse-derived material were written in various languages, such as Latin (e.g. the *Etymologiae* by Isidore of Seville, *Historia francorum* by Gregory of Tours, or *Historia langobardorum* by Paulus Diaconus), Old and Middle English, and Irish.<sup>15</sup> Yet, whereas the information in the Latin texts tends to be restricted to personal and place-names which have been Latinized, the terms recorded in English and Irish sources have undergone various processes of adaptation (see, for instance, below, 2.2.1.1 and 2.2.2.3.B); therefore, these sources can only provide us with a mediated — and hence somewhat distorted — picture of the language. The Old Norse literary documents include eddic and skaldic poems, which, despite possibly dating from the period under consideration, have only been recorded in sources dating from the twelfth century onwards. The dating of eddic poetry can be highly controversial (see Fidjestøl 1999), whereas skaldic

2010].

<sup>15</sup> E.g. Marstrander, on the basis of the representation of Norse-derived terms in Old Irish, suggested that there existed a phonemic distinction between the reflexes of the *i*-umlauted /u/ and *u*-umlauted /i/ (Marstrander 1915: 72–73; cp. Antonsen 1961 and Antonsen 1967). However, this suggestion has been heavily criticized (see Benediktsson 1963: 418, Benediktsson 1974: 95–96, and R. King 1972: 191 and n. 17).



poetry can be dated with more certainty if the author is known and the attribution of the poem is reliable. The oldest remaining skaldic poem is thought to be *Ragnarsdrápa*, which describes a painted shield and is attributed to the ninth-century poet Bragi Boddason; another poem which can be associated with this period with some certainty is *Hauströng* by Þjóðolf of Hvinir. Somewhat later are *Húsdrápa* by Ulf Uggason and *Þórsdrápa* by Eilíf Goðrunarson, both of whom lived *c.* 1000 (see further Clunies Ross 2005: 54–58). There are a few individual stanzas, or *lausavísur*, which may also belong to this early period, but given their anonymity, this dating is more problematic. The linguistic information provided by these texts is also slightly limited due to the mediation, not of the phonological system of another language, but of the phonological and graphemic systems of later stages of the Scandinavian languages. Yet, given the metrical constraints which characterize skaldic poetry, we can assume that their records probably provide us with linguistic material closer to Viking Age Norse than the records of eddic poetry, which exhibits much less complex metrics.

Despite being much shorter than the aforementioned poems, runic inscriptions constitute the main source of information for this period. However, they also have their own problems. On the one hand, their dating, which relies on archaeological, linguistic, or runological information, remains in many cases uncertain; furthermore, their distribution is very uneven, both chronologically and geographically: while only Norwegian and Swedish inscriptions survive for the period between *c.* 600 and 800, the number of Danish inscriptions increases very rapidly from *c.* 800, ‘thus making Denmark the epigraphical center of Scandinavia during the early Viking period’ (Würth 2002: 700). On the other hand, there does not exist a one-to-one relationship between the runic symbols and the Viking Age Norse phonemes which they are supposed to represent. This statement applies to the two runic systems, the elder futhark, consisting of twenty-four symbols, and the younger futhark, where the repertoire of symbols was reduced to sixteen.<sup>16</sup> Despite these problems, runic inscriptions are frequently used below to exemplify Viking Age Norse forms. The quotations rely on the *Samnordisk runtextdatabas*, which has a nearly complete record of all the Scandinavian runic inscriptions.<sup>17</sup> The inscriptions are referred to by the same signatures as in the database.

<sup>16</sup> For a summary of these issues, see Knirk 2002, with further references.

<sup>17</sup> Quotations from runic inscriptions are given in bold; quotations from inscriptions in the Roman alphabet are given in capitals.

The Scandinavian sources are not the only problematic ones, though. Many texts from the Old English period are believed to have been lost (see e.g. R. M. Wilson 1970). Whether that is the case or not, it is certainly true that our records are patchy at best (see Hogg 2006a: 353–59); we do not always have continuity of texts from a dialectal area through the Old English period, and in fact, there are some areas we hardly have any Old English records from (see e.g. Fisiak 2001). This makes the analysis of Old English dialectology very difficult (see Hogg 1988, Kitson 2004, and Hogg 2006b). Sadly for the present study, the textual sources from the areas where the Scandinavians settled down are particularly scant, while most Old English texts seem to have been written down in West Saxon speaking areas or, at least, following West Saxon linguistic practices. Most of the Norse-derived terms recorded in English texts are first attested during the Middle English period. We would probably have a different picture of the Old English period if we had more texts from the areas settled by the Scandinavian newcomers because these are the areas where one would expect to find a higher level of linguistic influence. Furthermore and closely associated with this problem, it is in many cases very difficult to know when or where an Old English text was written down, let alone when or where it was composed (see further Appendix II). Thus, the dearth of Old English sources and the problems which they involve do not allow for an in-depth, completely precise study of the process of dialectal integration of the Norse-derived terms in Old English (see further Chapter 3).

## **1.6.2. Linguistic Issues**

### **1.6.2.1. Dialectal variation in Old Norse**

It should be clear by now that, when we compare an Old English term with a Norse term, we are not necessarily comparing like with like because the Norse term may not have been written down until a time closer to the Middle English period. As pointed out above, 1.2, the dialectal character of the Norse term being brought into the discussion could also be a problem. Barnes has time and again reminded us that we cannot assume that the language spoken in Scandinavia both during the Viking Age and earlier was free from dialectal isoglosses of a phonological nature or otherwise (Barnes 1993 and Barnes 1997; cp. Barnes 2003 and Isakson 2000). While this fully agrees with sound linguistic principles, it is a different matter whether talking about dialectal differences in the language of the Scandinavian newcomers is indeed necessary for

the present study. It is widely accepted that, whereas the groups of Scandinavian marauders and settlers might have been composed of people from different dialectal areas (see Keynes 1997: 74), different areas of Anglo-Saxon England seem to have been in closer contact with some dialects than others. The majority of the Scandinavians who settled in the Danelaw seem to have originated from Viking Age Denmark, which comprised the areas which nowadays constitute Denmark and southern Sweden (see Roesdahl 1982: 9 and 15). This leads Barnes (Barnes 1993: 377) to include the Danelaw amongst the areas where Old East Norse would have been spoken. Yet, even though the initial settlement might have been mainly associated with Old East Norse speakers, we should not forget that Hiberno-Norse leaders took control of York and its surrounding areas during the first half of the tenth century, and it is also people of this origin who are supposed to have settled west of the Pennines (see Jesch 2000 and Pons-Sanz 2000: 19–23, with references).

Amongst the features recorded in the earliest manuscripts (Icelandic and Norwegian *c.* 1150, Danish and Swedish *c.* 1250–75) which are commonly presented as the dividing isoglosses between Old West and East Norse (see Haugen 1976: 210–13, Haugen 1993: 131, Barnes 1993: 377, Barnes 1997, and Ottosson 2002: 789–92), two require close attention because of their possible significance in the identification of the dialectal origin of Norse-derived loan-words in Old English: different degrees of representation of *u*-umlaut and Old East Norse monophthongization.

Benediktsson (Benediktsson 1963) offers a very clear analysis of the attested dialectal differences regarding the effects of *u*-umlaut, as well as a convincing explanation for such divergence. The written records (<o, ao, q>) suggest that /a/ (a low-back unrounded phoneme) was rounded before an \*/u/ that was subsequently lost ('earlier' umlaut) and before /w/, regardless of whether it was lost or preserved. This gave rise to the new low-back rounded phoneme /ɔ/. However, before an /u/ that was retained, only Icelandic manuscripts and manuscripts from Western Norway show similar representations, while East Norwegian manuscripts, as well as Old Danish and Swedish records, use <a> consistently. This might suggest that *u*-umlaut did not take place throughout all the dialects in these circumstances (generally known as 'younger' umlaut) or that these spellings point towards a reversion to a non-rounded vowel. Benediktsson suggests that, with the syncope of /u/, all the Scandinavian dialects phonemicized the result of *u*-umlaut, for it was only the difference between /a/ and /ɔ/ that would distinguish, for instance, /land/ (sing.) and /lond/ (pl.). However, before an /u/ that was retained, the difference in rounding

between the two vowels was neutralized, which meant that the two phonemes merged in that position into an archiphoneme which Benediktsson represents as /*Ä*/. This would be a low-back phoneme, with rounding or unrounding as a redundant feature. This archiphoneme would have been represented with more or less rounding in the different dialectal areas. We could assume that the phonetic representation was closer to /*a*/ in the east and closer to /*ɔ*/ in the west. Yet we cannot discount the possibility that ‘the spelling with “*a*” or with “*q*” does not indicate complete phonetic identity with *a* and *ɔ* respectively, but it is rather the result of an orthographic one-to-one identification’ (Benediktsson 1963: 423; cp. Widmark 1959 and Barnes 2003: 55–56).

This explanation can be applied to the situation in Viking Age Norse because the loss of /*u*/ in those cases representing ‘earlier’ umlaut did not take place in all environments at the same time but was determined by syllabic structure. Ralph explains the periodization of syncope:

Medial syncope operated after heavy and light syllables, and final syncope after heavy syllables or in tri- and multisyllabic words during the first syncope period. It is generally agreed that the final syncope in disyllabic words with short stressed syllables postdates the first period significantly, constituting a second period of syncope. (Ralph 2002: 712)

It is very difficult to date these two periods with any precision. There is, however, runic evidence which suggests that the first period was underway in the seventh century: the Björketorp stone (DR 360; Jacobson and Moltke 1941–42: 410–14) records the loss of /*u*/ after a long syllable in **sbA**, nom. sing. (< \**spahu* < PGmc \**spaxō*; cp. OIc *spǫ* > *spá* ‘prophecy’; Nielsen 2000: 96), which suggests that the phonemicization of /*ɔ*/ has already taken place (cp. Barnes 1993: 376).<sup>18</sup> Yet we also have seemingly contradictory evidence regarding the contexts of the first period: Ralph (Ralph 2002: 712) points out that, whereas we have forms like **karuR**, nom. sing. (i.e. \**garuR*, cp. OIc *gǫrr* ‘skilled, ready’), on the Swedish Rök stone (Ög. 136, c. 830; Bugge 1910b and Brate 1911–18: 130) and **makur**, nom. sing. (cp. OIc *mǫgr* ‘son, boy’), on the Sparlösa stone (Vg. 119, c. 800; Jungner and Svärdström 1940–71: 192–229), the latter also

<sup>18</sup> The etymological explanations of the Old Icelandic terms, unless otherwise stated, rely on de Vries 1961 or Pokorny 1959–69, while the reconstructions of Proto-Germanic terms generally rely on Orel 2003. The Björketorp stone belongs to the group of the so-called Blekinge stones, which Jacobson and Moltke (Jacobson and Moltke 1941–42: 410–14) and Moltke (Moltke 1985: 137–47) date to the late Proto-Nordic period, i.e. c. 500 x 700/50. Unless otherwise stated, the dates of the other runic inscriptions follow those provided by the editions consulted.

records **sunr**, nom. sing. (< PGmc *\*sunuz*; cp. OIc *sunr*, *sonr* ‘son’). Regarding the second period of syncope, evidence is also scarce. Heusler (Heusler 1950: §69) suggests that all the stages of the ‘earlier’ umlaut had already taken place by 850, whereas Noreen (Noreen 1923: §80.2) dates the loss of final /u/ in disyllabic words with a short root syllable to *c.* 900 (cp. Brøndum-Nielsen 1950: §85 Anm. 3, and Isakson 2000: 40, who points out that it is the case especially for the southern Scandinavian linguistic area).

This suggests that *u*-umlaut might not have been phonemicized in all the contexts comprised by the ‘earlier’ umlaut by the time of the initial settlement of the Scandinavian newcomers in the mid-ninth century. If we reconstruct a Viking Age Norse form like *\*lagu* (cp. OIc *lög* ‘law’), we can assume that the root vowel is likely to have been pronounced with some rounding, i.e. we can assume *phonetic* umlaut even if there was not *phonemic* umlaut (cp. Benediktsson 1963: 415–16). Yet the fact that the vowel generally appears as /a/ in Old (and Middle) English (see below, 2.4.1.E) cannot be easily identified as a sign of Old East Norse rather than Old West Norse influence (see Björkman 1900–02: 289). We should remember that rounding seems to have been a general process in ‘earlier’ umlaut contexts, and there is not definitive evidence against the possibility that there was initially also some rounding in those contexts associated with the ‘younger’ umlaut. Instead, the presence of /a/ in Old (and Middle) English terms assumed to derive from words which have, sooner or later, undergone *u*-umlaut can be interpreted in relation to the Old English phonological system and not as a clear indication of whether umlaut had or had not taken place yet (cf. Brøndum-Nielsen 1950: §85 Anm. 3). In this respect, and before we proceed any further, it is useful to point out that Benediktsson (Benediktsson 1963: 416–18, and Benediktsson 1974: 89) argues in favour of seeing the vocalic phonological system which emerged as a result of the *i*- and *u*-umlaut processes as one with three heights, where the only feature that differentiates /a/ from /ɔ/ is rounding (cp. R. King 1972: 187).<sup>19</sup> This system is slightly different from the generally assumed four-height phonological system in which /ɔ/ would be slightly higher than /a/ but lower than /o/ (e.g. Haugen 1950b: 32, and Antonsen 1961: 222). Benediktsson’s proposal implies that Old English speakers would have identified the sound

<sup>19</sup> *i*-umlaut is a more general phonological process in Germanic which is supposed to have taken place (or at least, to have started) before *u*-umlaut, in accordance with the fact that, generally speaking, syncope of /i/ seems to have been earlier than syncope of /u/. On *i*-umlaut in North Germanic, see Rasmussen 2000, Iverson and Salmons 2004, with references, and below, note 23 in Chapter 2.

as representing a low-back phoneme and, therefore, it was very easily adapted as /ɑ/. This was the only low-back phoneme in Old English, where rounding was not a distinctive feature in this context (cp. Dance 2003: 115). If a four-height system, where /ɑ/ and /ɔ/ contrasted with regard to rounding as well as height, is assumed instead, the identification may not have been as easy: Old English speakers would still have identified the sound as non-high-back, with rounding not playing an important role either because, as far as the Old English mid vowels are concerned, rounding would have been distinctive only for the front series (i.e. /e/ vs /ø/, the reflex of *i*-umlauted /o/; see Hogg 1992: §5.77, and Lass 1992a). Old English speakers would then have had a choice between /ɑ/ and /ɔ/; the effects of this existing choice might be reflected in *hold* and *hofding* (see below, 2.2.1.2.D–E).

The second dividing feature worth paying attention to is the Old East Norse monophthongization, by which /ai/, /au/ and /øy/ (the reflex of *i*-umlauted /au/) became /e:/, /ø:/ (and /o:/; see Widmark 2001: 86, and Barnes 2003: 61) and /ø:/, respectively.<sup>20</sup> As pointed out by Jacobsen and Moltke (Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 852–54, s.v. *monofthongering*), the oldest piece of evidence showing monophthongization is the Danish Gørlev stone (DR 239, c. 900; Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 292–94), which records **risþi stin** (cp. OIc *reisti stein* ‘raised a stone’), with the *i*-rune representing /e:/. Jelling 1 records what may be the earliest dateable example of monophthongization of /au/, viz. **þusi**, acc. pl. (DR 41, c. 935; cf. **þausi** in DR 42 and Jelling 2, c. 985; Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 65–81), where the *u*-rune is likely to represent /ø/. The monophthongization of /ai/ seems to have been carried through earlier than that of /au/ because the seemingly monophthongized reflex of the former commonly coexists with non-monophthongized /au/ in the same inscription (e.g. **risþi stin** vs **taupr**, nom. sing., cp. OIc *daudr* ‘dead’, in DR 259, a post-Jelling stone from Fuglie; Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 312–14). Thus, as far as runic graphs can be taken as reliable representations of phonemes, Jacobsen and Moltke appear to be right when explaining that /ai/ was the first diphthong to undergo monophthongization, while this change did not affect /au/ until later (cp. Faarlund 1975: 174). Faarlund (Faarlund 1975 and Faarlund 1994: 41) localizes the epicentre of monophthongization in Jutland and explains that it spread gradually east through Denmark and north through southern and central Sweden and parts of eastern Norway. The process of monophthongization could be dated to c. 900 x 1100 (cp. Faarlund 1975: 172–74, Faarlund

<sup>20</sup> On the representation of the Viking Age Norse reflexes of PGmc \*/ai/ and \*/au/, see below, 2.2.1.1–2.



1994: 41, Barnes 1993: 35, and Widmark 2001: 85–86; cf. Antonsen 2002: 297–314, who would like to date monophthongization as early as the seventh century). However, we should bear in mind that, even in Denmark, it does not seem to have been carried through completely by 1000. This date suggests that the loan-words recorded during the Old English period should not be necessarily expected to show the effects of monophthongization (cp. Lehiste 1958: 20, and Townend 2002: 106; see below, 2.2.1.3.B). Therefore, lack of monophthongization cannot be easily taken as an indication of the Old West Norse rather than Old East Norse origin of the terms.

We can conclude that, while dialectal variation is likely to have existed in Viking Age Norse and was probably represented in the speech of the Scandinavian settlers in England, we cannot easily rely on the phonology of the Norse loan-words recorded in Old English texts so as to establish their initial dialectal origin. Therefore, this is not an issue which will be explored in much detail unless other factors make it necessary.

### 1.6.2.2. Evidence for Norse-derivation

While the possibility of identifying the dialectal origin of a loan's etymon is indeed an important issue when dealing with the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact, the identification of the loans themselves and the problems involved in that process are much more significant matters. These problems arise in the main from the similarity between the two languages. After analysing the morphological and phonological relationship between Old English and Old Norse, Nielsen concludes that

OE has more exclusive (and active) parallels in common with ON than with any other language except OFris., which suggests that pre-ON and pre-OE were once in immediate contact (or that there was a Scandinavian element among the fifth- and sixth-century invaders). (Nielsen 1985: 258)

Similarly, Carr (Carr 1939: 80–82) presents a long list of parallel and independent compounds in Old English and Old Norse, which makes the similarity between their vocabularies and word-formation practices evident. While the closeness between the two languages is likely to have allowed for a significant degree of mutual intelligibility (see Townend 2002, and below, 2.2.1.1), it makes attempts to identify Norse-derived terms in Old English quite difficult. There are, however, ways in which researchers can overcome this problem in order to establish the terms which can be considered to be Norse-derived. These factors are discussed below in 2.1.





## ETYMOLOGICAL STUDY

### *2.1. The Identification of Norse-Derived Terms*

As noted above, 1.6.1 and 1.6.2.2, one of the main problems facing scholars interested in analysing the Norse-derived terms in Old English is the difficulty in ascertaining in the first instance the terms that should be considered in the study. This difficulty arises from the scarcity of sources, the closeness of the two languages involved, and the chronological distance that separates us from the languages under consideration. There are, however, some pieces of evidence that scholars can turn to. They differ in connection with the type of loan under consideration (see above, 1.2) and vary greatly in terms of their reliability.

The identification of a loan-word and the foreign component of a loan-blend is most reliable when it is based on phonological criteria, as suggested by Björkman:

If a word in English has a form which cannot be explained by means of internal English sound-laws, but which is easily accounted for by assuming a Scandinavian origin, we are, for the most part, entitled to consider the word in question a Scandinavian loan-word.<sup>1</sup>

Unfortunately, as section 2.2 shows, there are not many terms in the corpus of this study for which phonological criteria can be said to present definitive evidence. This is partially due to the fact that Old English speakers seem to

<sup>1</sup> Björkman 1900–02: 30. For an overview of Old Norse phonology, see Noreen 1904, Noreen 1913, and Noreen 1923; for an overview of Old English phonology, see Hogg 1992; for a comparison of the two languages at the time of linguistic contact, see Townend 2002: ch. 2.

have been able to work out phonological correspondences between the two languages and to have carried out phonological substitutions so as to bring the terms closer to their phonological structure (see Townend 2002: 61–63, 95, and 108, as well as below, 2.2.1.1). Folk etymology can similarly blur phonological evidence (see below, 2.2.1.2.E, 2.2.1.3.C, 2.4.1.F, and 2.5.A).

Morphological evidence can also be used in some cases to identify the foreign element in English. The reliability of this type of evidence is varied, though. The presence of Norse inflectional endings is much more suggestive of Norse derivation than, for instance, the fact that a term exhibits a morphological process which is not attested in Old English for that word-field (see below, 2.3),<sup>2</sup> or a morphological process which is more common in Old Norse than in Old English (see, for instance, below, III.2.1.A; cp. Dance 2011: 88–89). Unfortunately, not many terms in the corpus have Norse inflectional endings. Thus, the Norse derivation of most of the very few terms for which morphological evidence is of any significance cannot be presented as anything definitive.

In most cases, though, scholars can only rely on factors the problematic character of which cannot be ignored. These factors include the following:

- (1) Cultural evidence: it can refer to the introduction of a term following a new concept or object which did not exist in the cultural world of the speakers of the recipient language,<sup>3</sup> as well as the mere association of a term with the Scandinavian attackers or newcomers. Needless to say, the reliability of the first type of evidence is much stronger than that of the second type. Loss of Old English texts as well as the impossibility of knowing the reason for the apparent association of a term with the Scandinavians and their culture (cp. Pons-Sanz 2008) are some of the factors behind the difference in reliability.
- (2) Textual attestation: if a term (or a particular meaning) is only attested once the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact was well under way, and if its use in Old Norse is particularly significant, whereas the term is hardly used in Old English, the possibility of Norse derivation may not be easily discounted. However, as in the previous case, loss of Old English texts renders this type of evidence very problematic.
- (3) Dialectal distribution: if a term is mainly associated with the dialectal areas where the Scandinavians settled down, the likelihood of its Norse deriva-

<sup>2</sup> This book uses *word-field* as an equivalent to *word-family*, i.e. it refers to a group of terms made up by a simplex and the complexes which have that simplex either as their base (in derivatives) or as one of their lexemes (in compounds).

<sup>3</sup> French philologists, following Deroy, call these terms *xénismes* (Deroy 1980: 224–29).

tion is higher than if it is attested in non-Scandinavianized areas. However, as noted by Dance, this type of evidence is far from being fully reliable:

there are many reasons why a particular writer or scribe should choose to use or not use a particular Scandinavian borrowing, and its occasional occurrence need not therefore imply it was in common use locally (spoken or otherwise), just as its non-occurrence need not mean it was simply unknown. (Dance 1999: 148)

- (4) Attestation in other West Germanic languages: a term without cognates in other West Germanic languages could be considered to be a more likely example of Norse derivation than a term for which cognates are otherwise recorded in West Germanic. The problematic character of this assumption is, however, exemplified by the loan-blend OE *brȳðhlōp* ‘wedding, wedding feast’. The phonological structure of the determinatum shows very clearly that this compound is Norse-derived (cp. OIc *hlaupa* vs OE *hlēapan* ‘to leap’, and OIc *brúðlaup* ‘wedding, wedding feast’; see below, 2.2.1.2.A), while the compound, for which a fully native equivalent is not recorded, has parallels in West Germanic (cp. OHG *brūtlouft* ‘wedding’; see also Dance 2003: 87).<sup>4</sup>

Given the problematic character of these factors, Norse derivation can only be safely claimed when the term in question exhibits either phonological or (definitive) morphological evidence. These types of evidence are obviously not available when dealing with loan-shifts, and this makes their identification particularly problematic. When analysing these terms we need to remember that the similarity between the two languages and the loss of a significant amount of Old English material do not allow us to discount the possibility of parallel and independent development. Furthermore, given that, with the exception of runic inscriptions and skaldic poems, the earliest records of the North Germanic languages are contemporary with Middle English rather than Old English (see above, 1.6.1), we cannot be certain that the suggested meaning had already developed by the time of the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact (see below, 2.4.1.B), or that the meaning did not develop in the Scandinavian languages following this contact.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>4</sup> The spellings and meanings of Old High German terms follow, in general, those provided by Splett 1993. For an innovative way of classifying the likelihood of the Norse-derivation of particular terms, see Dance 2011: 88–93, Dance 2012, Dance 2013, and Dance forthcoming b.

<sup>5</sup> Cp. the influence of the meaning of OE *ðegn* ‘retainer, a freeman who serves a noble or a king’ onto the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *þegn*; see Hofmann 1955: §283, who uses this evidence to belie the Norse derivation of OE *ðegengyld* ‘legal money value of a thane’ (see

The judgement of the researcher becomes then a very important tool. The different possibilities have to be weighed up against each other, and, therefore, the weight which each type of evidence is given varies among researchers. This means that there are discrepancies between the lists of Norse-derived terms accepted by the different studies. The present work may be seen as presenting a particularly sceptical view on the Norse derivation of many terms for which a foreign origin has frequently been suggested. This is due to the fact that in many cases Norse derivation is by no means necessary, nor is it even the best way to explain the extant evidence. Indeed, this study fully embraces Lass's opinion that 'anything can be borrowed, and often is; but in a given case it's always both simpler and safer to assume that it isn't, unless the evidence is clear and overwhelming' (Lass 1997: 201). Appendix III deals with the terms for which Norse derivation has been suggested but that suggestion is not accepted in this study.

## 2.2. *Phonological Evidence*

This section analyses the terms whose phonological structure can be considered to indicate Norse derivation.

### 2.2.1. Vowels

#### 2.2.1.1. PGmc \*/ai/ > OE /ɑ:/ vs Olc /ei/ (cp. VAN /ai/)

(e.g. PGmc \**stainaz* > OE *stān* 'stone' vs **stain** id., nom. sing., in DR 37, cp. Olc *steinn*; Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 62)<sup>6</sup>

The imitation of VAN /ai/ is not likely to have been too problematic for Old English speakers, because, even though they did not have an equivalent diphthong in their phonological system (see Hogg 1992: §7.69), the palatalization

below, III.4.SSS), Löfving 1991: 154, and Syrett 2000: 268. On the semantic development undergone by OE *ðegn*, see Loyn 1955, Gillingham 1995, Pelteret 1995: 304, and below, 3.4.2.6.A.4. On the difficulties involved in the identification of semantic loans, see further Hoad 1993.

<sup>6</sup> I follow Ralph (Ralph 2002: 705) in giving the Viking Age Norse reflex of the Proto-Germanic diphthong as /ai/ (as well as /au/ below); however, as Ralph himself points out (Ralph 2002: 711), we should assume that it was pronounced [æi], with the first component having been partially assimilated to the second (cp. Brøndum-Nielsen 1950: §105, where the diphthong is given as *æi*). This assimilation can clearly be associated with *i*-umlaut, /æ/ being the reflex of *i*-umlauted /ɑ/. Admittedly, /æ/ was later on assimilated with /e/. However, this process cannot be fully attributed to the Viking Age, and it seems to have been carried out mainly in Old Icelandic, although it is also present in Old Norwegian (see Noreen 1923: §§54, 97, and 117, and Benediktsson 1964).

of /g/ allowed for the combination of /æ/ + /j/ and /e/ + /j/ (e.g. OE *weg* ‘way, path’, which is attested as both <weg> and <wæg>).<sup>7</sup> It is therefore not surprising to find the reflexes of the Norse diphthong represented by <æg> and <eg> in Old English texts, both spellings being roughly equally frequent (Björkman 1900–02: 37 n. 2).

The terms whose Norse origin is suggested by the presence of the reflex of the Viking Age Norse diphthong instead of the native monophthong are the following:<sup>8</sup>

(A) OE *hail* ‘healthy’: < the Viking Age Norse adjective represented by OIc *heill* ‘healthy’ (cf. OE *hāl* id.). The adjective is attested in what seem to be two drinking formulae recorded as part of two scribbles in Arras, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 764, viz. ‘wes æil’ ‘be in health’ and ‘drinc hæl’ ‘drink in health’ (Scrib 3.1 (Ker) 1–2). The *OED* (*OED* 1989: s.v. *wassail*, n.) explains that, while OE *wes hāl* (sing.) / *wesað hāle* (pl.) is recorded as an ordinary salutation (cp. OIc *verið hail*, pl.), its use as a drinking formula is not recorded in any other Germanic language and may, therefore, have developed amongst the Scandinavian settlers in England (cp. the *OED* 1989: s.v. *drink-hail*, and Dance 2003: 190 n. 6, with references; see also Björkman 1900–02: 44). Ker (Ker 1990: no. 4) attributes the scribbles to an Anglo-Saxon scribe who may have been trained in a continental scriptorium (see further below, II.255); thus, the possibility that the formula did not develop from the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact, but rather from the contact with the Continent (cp. OHG *heil* ‘whole, healthy’) cannot be fully discounted.

(B) OE *scegð* ‘warship’: < the Viking Age Norse noun attested as *skaiþ*, acc. sing., in DR 230 (Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 281–84); cp. OIc *skeið* ‘warship’ (see Thier 2002: 33). The ultimate etymology of this term is not clear, although Pokorny (Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *skēi-*) and de Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *skeið*) would like to associate it with the PGmc verb *\*skaiþan* ‘to split, separate’. If that is the case, the problems involved in the lack of palatalization of the onset (see below, 2.2.2.2) and the presence of /θ/ instead of /d/ (see below, 2.2.2.3) suggest that the maintenance of the diphthong is the most reliable evidence of its Norse origin. In keeping with the fact that late West Saxon scribes could use <h> for <g> due to the devoicing of the voiced velar

<sup>7</sup> On the palatalization of OE /g/, see Hogg 1992: §§7.15–29.

<sup>8</sup> No bibliographical references regarding the Norse-derived character of a term are provided when the phonological structure is clear enough so as to make the foreign nature of the term almost undeniable.

fricative [ɣ] to [x], which also led them to represent /j/ with <h> occasionally (see A. Campbell 1959: §447, and Lass 1994: 76–77), we also find the spelling <scehð> in the mid-eleventh-century glosses to Aldhelm's *Prosa de virginitate* (AldV 1 (Goossens) 120 > AldV 13.1 (Nap) 28 > AldV 4 (Nap) 17).<sup>9</sup> Only once is this term recorded with <ei> in the *OEC* (viz. <sceiðman> in LawIIAtr 7; cf. <scegðman> in ÆGram 24.9 and AntGl 2 (Kindschi) 252); the presence of <i> for <g> is not uncommon in Old English texts for native terms (Hogg 1992: §7.19), but given that the term appears in the late eleventh- or early twelfth-century manuscript Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 383 (Ker 1990: no. 65), we could associate <ei> with the common Middle English spellings for the reflexes of the Norse diphthong (cp. <onweig> in LawIIAtr 6.1 for OE *on wege*, and <sceidmannus> in the *Quadripartitus*; see Björkman 1900–02: 40–60). In Ch 1487 (Whitelock 13) 35 the term appears to have been recorded as <scæðe>, which may show the late West Saxon loss of /j/ when it appears between a vowel and a dental consonant and the compensatory lengthening of the vowel (Hogg 1992: §7.71; cp. Björkman 1900–02: 38 n. 2). It is noteworthy that this is the only context where the term appears as a feminine noun ('minre scæðe'), as in Old Norse (cf. 'ænne scegð' in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1008.3 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1008.3 = ChronE (Irvine) 1008.3 and Ch 1492 (Nap-Steven 10) 5; cp. Whitelock 1930: 137 n. to l. 23). The term soon became a productive element in English, as suggested by the compound OE *scegðmann* 'pirate, sailor, viking', which, as pointed out by Fell (Fell 1986: 302), is likely to be a new formation rather than a loan-blend because no equivalent compound is attested in Old Norse.

(C) OE *swegen* '(young) man': < the Viking Age Norse noun attested as **suain**, acc. sing., in Ög. 66 (Brate 1911–18: 67–68), and as **sueinAR**, nom. pl., in Sm. 16 (Kinander 1935–61: 64–67); cp. OIc *sveinn* 'boy, servant' < PGmc \**swainaz*; cf. OE *swān* 'herdsman, man'.<sup>10</sup>

The process of full adaptation of a loan-word through the replacement of the Norse diphthong with the equivalent native monophthong may be attested in connection with OE *hrān* 'reindeer' (cp. OIc *hreinn* 'reindeer'), which is only recorded either as a simplex or as part of the compound *stalhrān* 'decoy-reindeer' in the Old English Orosius (Or 1 1.15.9, 1.15.10, 1.15.11, and 1.15.18; see Björkman 1900–02: 48 n. 1, Thomson 1957: 84, Fell 1984a: 62, Townend 2002: 95, and above, note 3 in Chapter 1).<sup>11</sup> Townend suggests that the replace-

<sup>9</sup> On the relationship between the Aldhelmian glosses, see below, II.4.

<sup>10</sup> Cp. OE *bātswegen* 'boatman' (see above, note 2 in Chapter 1).

<sup>11</sup> The term is not always accepted to be a loan-word; see Holthausen 1934: s.v. *hrān*,

ment is an indication that ‘even at this early point of contact an adequate switching-code [i.e. the ability to work out phonological correspondences] had been established’ (Townend 2002: 95).<sup>12</sup> This ability could indeed be taken as a sign of mutual intelligibility between the speakers of the two languages (see Townend 2001: 60).

### 2.2.1.2. PGmc \*/au/ > OE /æ:ɑ/ vs OIc /au/ (cp. VAN /au/)

(e.g. PGmc \**ðauðaz* > OE *dēad* ‘torpid’ vs *taupr* ‘dead’ in DR 117; Jacobson and Moltke 1941–42: 155–56; cp. OIc *dauðr*).

The Norse diphthong /au/ (which was probably pronounced [ɔu], with more or less rounding in the first element) seems to have been adapted in Old English as /o:/, as suggested by the consistent <o> spelling. This adaptation requires further comment. In Old English /w/ was not supposed to occur finally after a vowel but, following its analogical restoration on the basis of inflected forms, we also find cases such as OE *snāw* for *snā* ‘snow’ (cp. nom. / acc. pl. *snāwas*; Hogg 1992: §§3.17, 4.9, and 7.72; see also Hogg 1992: §7.69). Thus, we might have expected to find a similar process of adaptation to that followed by the reflexes of VAN /ai/; indeed, the reflexes of the diphthong in Middle English texts are commonly spelt <au, aw, ou, ow> (cp. IV.2.1.D), which suggests that they have merged with the native Middle English diphthongs /au/, /ou/ (see Björkman 1900–02: 78–81, and Kolb 1989: 286). /o:/ is not, however, a bad option for the adaptation of the Norse diphthong: it is a back sound like the two elements of the original diphthong, it has an intermediate height, and it is likely to be closer in length to the diphthong than a short vowel (cp. J. Clark and Yallop 1990: 174–75).

The terms whose Norse origin is suggested by the adapted monophthong instead of the native diphthong are the following:<sup>13</sup>

(A) OE *brȳdhlōp* ‘ceremony of conducting a bride to her new home; wedding, wedding feast’: < OE *brȳd* ‘bride’ (cf. OIc *brúðr* id.) + the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *hlaup* ‘leap, jump’ (cf. OE *hlēapan* ‘to leap, run’); cp. OIc *brúðlaup* ‘wedding, wedding feast’.

Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *ker-*, and Orel 2003: s.v. \**xrainaz*. However, the facts that it is only recorded in Ohthere’s account and that there do not seem to exist cognates in other West Germanic languages suggest that it is not likely to be native.

<sup>12</sup> On the communicative situation which would have given rise to the use of this Norse-derived term, see above, 1.1.

<sup>13</sup> On the possible association of OE *ðc* with this group of words, see below, 2.5.P.



(B) OE *cōp* ‘purchase’: < the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *kaup* ‘bargain’ (< L *caupo* ‘petty tradesman’; cf. OE *cēap* ‘purchase, sale’).<sup>14</sup> The Norse-derived noun is only recorded in compounds: it appears as the determinatum in OE *landcōp* ‘purchase of land’ (see Neff 1989: 289–90; LawIIIATR 3): < OE *land* ‘land’ (cp. OIc *land* id.) + *cōp*; and in OE *lahcōp* ‘money paid for legal rights’ (LawIIIATR 3): < OE *lagu* ‘law’ (< VAN \**lagu* id., cp. OIc *lög*) + *cōp* (see below, 2.4.1.E). The loan-word is also recorded as the determinant in OE *caupland* ‘purchased land’ (Ch IWm (Farrer 89) 7, a Yorkshire charter), where the original Norse diphthong seems to have been maintained; the phonological form of the determinant may be associated with the late date of the charter and its extant copies and, therefore, with the reflexes of the Norse diphthong in Middle English (see further below, II.17.1.11). In the three cases, we also find attestations of equivalent compounds with the native OE *cēap*: OE *landcēap* and *lahcēap* in LawNorthu 67.1 and *cēapland* in Ch 1527 (Whitelock 24) 7, a charter dealing with lands in Suffolk.

The late attestation of the compounds and the fact that, at least as far as the compounds with OE *cōp* as the determinatum are concerned, they are first recorded with a seemingly Norse-derived form may suggest that the compounds are loans based on the Norse equivalents (cp. OIc *landkaup* ‘purchase of land’, *lögkaup* ‘lawful bargain’, and *kaupaland* ‘purchased land’) and that their attestations with OE *cēap* should simply be analysed as cases where the Norse-derived element has been replaced with the native cognate (see Björkman 1900–02: 12, Hofmann 1955: §258, Peters 1981: 90 and 92, the *DOE*: s.v. *ceap-land*, *cop-land*, and Hough 1995–96: 74). Things, however, are not that simple.

As far as the purchase of land is concerned, we have to bear in mind that this is an activity which was, by no means, unknown to the Anglo-Saxons before the arrival of the Scandinavian newcomers (see J. Campbell 1989; cf. Fellows-Jensen 1984: 148). It is clear that it continued to be carried out after they started to settle down, most notably in association with the Benedictine Reform during Edgar’s reign (see Kennedy 1995). Thus, the compound OE *landcēap* is also recorded in Ch 204 (HarmD 3) 6, a charter dated to 844 x 845 by the *Electronic Sawyer* (no. 204) which is recorded in a more or less contemporary manuscript (viz. Canterbury, Dean and Chapter Library, MS Ch. Ant. C. 1280).

The purchase of one’s legal rights, either to buy oneself off from outlawry or to gain the right to be heard in court, might indeed be something which developed

<sup>14</sup> Translations of Latin terms follow, unless otherwise specified, those provided by Lewis and Short 1879.



together with the arrival of the Scandinavian newcomers (see Stenton 1971: 512, and Neff 1989: 290–91). There is, however, no reason to understand OE *lahcōp* / *lahcēap* as referring to the purchase of legal rights; it may simply refer to any lawful bargain, one not necessarily involving land, a possession which has already been covered by OE *landcōp* / *landcēap* in the same documents. It may, therefore, be the case that the compounds represent native new formations rather than loan-translations (see below, 2.4.1.E). Similarly, there is no reason to suggest a Norse-derived origin for OE *cēapland* in Ch 1527 (Whitelock 24).

More importantly, while the Norse origin of OE *caup-* in OE *caupland* seems to be clear, the case of OE *cōp* is slightly more problematic. When discussing this noun, it is important to bear in mind the verbal form ‘copade’, which renders L *conpilabat* (cp. L *compilare* ‘to plunder, pillage’) in ClGI 1 (Stryker) 1502 together with OE ‘stæl’ (‘stole’). Meritt (Meritt 1968: 105–06) argues that, by studying the gloss’s lemma in its context, which has been identified as belonging to Gildas’s *De excidio et conquestu Britanniae*, one can clearly see that ‘copade’ does actually mean ‘traded, bartered’: ‘stæl’ refers to Judas’s thievery and ‘copade’ refers to his bartering for thirty pieces of silver. Meritt concludes his analysis saying that ‘the gloss *copade* is related to *cēapian*, “bargain, trade” with the vowel as in *landcōp* and *lahcōp*, and is possibly the etymon of Middle English *choppen*<sup>4</sup> “to bargain”’ (Meritt 1968: 106). It is hard to know what to make of this conclusion: should we assume that, together with the noun, we also have in Old English a Norse-derived verb belonging to the same word-field (cp. Bammesberger 1979: 28)? This possibility would have to account for the presence of the affricate in the Middle English verb by relying on its assimilation with the OE *cēap* word-field. Or should we assume that, contrary to scholarly tradition, OE *cōp* in the aforementioned compounds and ‘copade’ (a form of OE *cōpian*?) are actually native terms which exhibit less common by-forms of the Latin-derived word-field? If so, the aforementioned suggestion for the presence of the affricate would also be appropriate here. The scholars following Meritt’s explanation attribute a native origin to ‘copade’ and analyse it as a by-form of OE *cēapian* (see W. Morris 1968: 38–40, the *DOE*: s.v. *copian*; cp. the *OED* 1989: s.vv. *chapman* and *chop*, v.<sup>2</sup>). If we want to assume that <o> in ‘copade’ cannot be understood as a dittograph derived from the presence of the vowel in the lemma,<sup>15</sup> two accounts can be given for the development of a native by-form of OE *cēapian*. One account relies on two facts: (1) that L *caupo*

<sup>15</sup> An intended monophthongal form for the verb is not difficult to imagine; cp. ‘ceping’, which glosses L *mercimonium* ‘goods, merchandise’ in ClGI 1 (Stryker) 4058 and ‘to cepienne’ as a gloss for L *ad uendentes* (cp. L *vendere* ‘to sell’) in OccGI 51.1.1 (Meritt) 19.

had the by-forms *L cōpo* and *cūpo* (see Lewis and Short 1879: s.v. *caupo*; cp. *L cōpo* as the lemma for *L negotiator* ‘businessman, tradesman’ in HlGl (Oliphant) C1322, and *L caupona* ‘a female shop-keeper; tavern’ vs *L cōpa* ‘a female tavern-keeper and castanet-dancer’); and (2) that Campbell (A. Campbell 1959: §506) explains that, while stressed /o:/ in early Latin loan-words normally develops as /u:/, it is retained as /o:/ in later borrowings (cp. OE *Rūm-* < *L Rōma* vs OE *mōr-* ‘mulberry’ < *L mōrus* ‘mulberry-tree’). The second account is based on Bammesberger’s suggestion that the root syllable in the verb may exhibit the effects of a change in stress, according to which /æ:ɑ/ > /ɑ:/ (cp. the *OED* 1989: s.v. *chapman*), as well as /ɑ:/ > /o:/ (Bammesberger 1979: 28). The latter process is mainly associated with terms with low-stress variants (Hogg 1992: §5.7); however, it can also be traced in fully stressed words (see Klaeber 1902: 270–71). If the native origin of the verb is accepted (and its context cannot be taken as an indication that this is unlikely to be the case),<sup>16</sup> then we should think very carefully about OE *cōp*. The diphthong in the root of OE *caup-* and ME *coupen* ‘to buy’ is indicative of its Norse origin (cp. OIc *kaupa* ‘to buy, to bargain’), but, when seen in this light, there is nothing in the form of OE *cōp* to argue clearly in favour of its being a Norse rather than a late Latin loan-word or a native by-form of an early Latin loan-word. Thus, the phonological evidence in favour of its Norse origin has to be supplemented by the fact that *III Æthelred* seems to reflect the legal practices in the Scandinavianized area of the Five Boroughs (see below, II.13.1.5).

(C) OE *ōra* ‘a unit of account of Danish origin’: < the Viking Age Norse noun attested as *aura*, acc. pl., in Hs 7 (Liestøl 1979; < *L aura* ‘golden’); cp. OIc *aurar*, pl. of *eyrir* ‘ounce of silver, the eighth part of a mark’ (see Matzerath 1912: 23, and Engeler 1991: 127–29).

The Norse diphthong may be further represented by two terms, although evidence is not definitive:

(D) OE *hofding* ‘chief, leader’: It is generally understood to derive from the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *hofðingi* ‘chief, leader’. De Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *hofðingi*) associates its first component with OIc *hofð* ‘head’,<sup>17</sup> regardless of whether the second element of the term should be associated with OIc *gengi* ‘help, support’ or rather with the suffix *-ing* (cp. MLG *hōveding* / *hovetlink* ‘chieftain’, OE *hēafodling* ‘equal, fellow-servant’).<sup>18</sup> OIc *hofð* has a by-

<sup>16</sup> See below, II.10.

<sup>17</sup> Cp. *selshofp* ‘seal’s head’, nom. sing., a by-name recorded in IR 1 (Barnes and others 1997: 50–53).

<sup>18</sup> The translations of Middle Low German terms rely on Schiller and Lübben 1875–81.

form *haufuð* (cp. OE *hafod* / *hēafod* ‘head’). It is therefore not clear whether the term derives from PGmc *\*xabuðan* (cp. L *caput* ‘head’), which would suggest that OIc *haufuð* is a secondary form where the presence of the second /u/ has led to the development of the diphthong; or whether the Proto-Germanic form was *\*xaubūðan*, which would suggest that OIc *hofð* has arisen as a result of the simplification of the diphthong because of dissimilation. We therefore do not know which form(s) the Anglo-Saxons would have come into contact with. If they encountered the Old Norse reflex of PGmc *\*xabuðan*, the selection of /o/ has to be associated with the presence of the same vowel in *hold* (see below, 2.2.1.2.E). It therefore exemplifies the choice faced by the speakers of Old English with regard to the adaptation of a *u*-umlauted /a/, at least phonetically if not phonologically (see above, 1.6.2.1). The presence of the labial consonant might have contributed to making rounding more perceptible; therefore, the vowel might have been perceived as being closer to OE /o/.<sup>19</sup> If the etymon of the Old English noun was instead a reflex of PGmc *\*xaubūðan*, then we need to explain the presence of a vowel which is commonly analysed as short in the Old English term (see Sweet 1896: s.v. *hofding*, Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *hofding*, and Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *hofding*). Given the late attestation of the term, we might want to account for it by referring to the transitional process between Old and Middle English involving vocalic shortening before groups of two consonants (except lengthening groups; see A. Campbell 1959: §285). Whatever the case, the loan-word also exhibits the substitution of OE /d/ for VAN /ð/ (see below, 2.2.2.3).

(E) OE *hold* ‘holder of allodial land, ranking below a *jarl*’: As is the case with the previous word, this simplex is generally attributed a short root vowel (see Sweet 1896: s.v. *hold*, Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *hold*, and Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *hold*, III). Thus, even though Old English spelling does not allow for a straightforward distinction between long and short vowels, the following lines assume that the vowel was short, in keeping with the general view.

Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 283, and Björkman 1901: 7) identifies this term as typically derived from Old West Norse because Old East Norse texts do not record any term which could be identified as its etymon (cp. Fellows-

Syrett 1994: 197–98 tacitly argues in favour of interpreting the second component of the Norse term as the suffix *-ing* because he discusses it in relation to the *i*-umlaut caused by some Proto-Norse suffixes; cp. OSwed. *höfpinge*, which also has variants without umlaut, as pointed out by Noreen 1904: §59.7.

<sup>19</sup> On the influence of intervening consonants on the process of umlaut, see Howell and Salmons 1997.

Jensen 1989: 90). Yet within this dialectal restriction, we encounter two possible etyma: OWN *holdr* ‘free owner of allodial land’ (< PGmc *\*xalubz*) and *hauldr*, a later by-form. Even though Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 290 n. 1) states that OE *hold* can hardly be associated with *hauldr*, the possibility cannot be discounted so easily. Noreen (Noreen 1923: §105) notes that, although the presence of OWN /au/ in front of /ng/ and /nk/ is a change that only started to be apparent in the fourteenth century, sporadic traces of the sound change taking place before /g/, /k/, and /l/ + consonant are attested earlier, OWN *hauldr* being one of them.<sup>20</sup> In any case, the derivation of OE *hold* from either term is problematic: if it had OWN *hauldr* as its etymon, we would expect a simplex with /o:/. If it is derived instead from OWN *holdr*, then the phonological reason to assign it a Norse origin is rather the presence of the vowel <o> instead of the expected <a> as the result of restoration of /a/ when a back vowel follows in the next syllable (see Hogg 1992: §§5.35–38). Had the word a native origin, the expected form would be *\*haluð* or *\*haloð* (cp. OE *hæled* < PGmc *\*xalibz*).<sup>21</sup> The form of the term suggests that /u/ had already been syncopated in Viking Age Norse and mutation had been phonemicized; /o/ would therefore represent the alternative way to adapt the *u*-umlauted vowel (see above, 1.6.2.1).

In sum, we are faced with the problem of explaining either the presence of /o/ instead of the expected /o:/: (if OE *hold* is derived from OWN *hauldr*), or the less common selection of /o/ instead of /a/ (if OWN *holdr* is taken as the etymon instead). The association of the term with the adjective OE *hold* ‘gracious, faithful’ might offer a possible solution for this phonological puzzle (cp. Fellows-Jensen 1989: 90, and Dance 2003: 152–53 n. 135). The fact that a nobleman would have been expected to be both *gracious* and *faithful* would have facilitated this association, which can be interpreted in terms of folk etymology.<sup>22</sup>

<sup>20</sup> This term is recorded, for instance, in Frost. X.37, X.46, XI.21, and XIX.7.

<sup>21</sup> OE *hæled* and OWN *holdr* are the reflexes of the same Proto-Germanic root with ablaut variation.

<sup>22</sup> On the effect of homonymy on borrowing, see Weinreich, who concludes that ‘potential homonymy as a source for resistance to transfer — at least as far as bilinguals are concerned — must [...] be regarded with skepticism’ (Weinreich 1963: 61).

### 2.2.1.3. The reflex of *i*-umlauted PGmc \*/au/: WS /i: e, y:/, nWS /e:/ vs OIc /ey/ (cp. VAN /æy, øy/)

(e.g. PGmc \**auþjanan* > WS *īðan* ‘to destroy’ vs OIc *eyða* id., attested as **auþi**, 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. sing. pres. subj., in DR 82; Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 117–19).<sup>23</sup>

Faarlund (Faarlund 1994: 41) explains that VAN /æy/ is likely to have been the initial result of the mutation, while the later labialization of /æ/ would have given rise to /øy/. Given the result of Old East Norse monophthongization (see above, 1.6.2.1), it is not unlikely that labialization had already taken place by the time of the Anglo-Scandinavian contact (see below). While the reflexes of this diphthong in Middle English tend to be spelt as <ai, ay, ei, ei>, representing /ai/ (see Björkman 1900–02: 63–67), the situation is slightly more complicated in Old English. The terms which should be discussed in this section are the following:

(A) The term which the *DOE* represents as OE *flēge* ‘little ship’ (cp. Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *flēge*) is actually recorded as <foege> in its only attestation in Old English (viz. JnGl (Li) 6.22 > JnGl (Ru) 6.22).<sup>24</sup> The digraph <oe> was a common spelling for the front, rounded, middle phonemes /ø/ and /ø:/ in the Old English dialects where rounding was still a distinctive feature in the mid-front vocalic series (these phonemes could be the result of *i*-umlaut or rounding after /w/). Northumbrian was clearly one of those dialects (Hogg 1992: §5.77; cp. Ross 1939–40: 43). Thus <oeg> seems to offer a close representa-

<sup>23</sup> *i*-umlaut is a process which is generally accepted to have taken place before *u*-umlaut; thus, we already find *i*-syncope after long vowels in the Swedish Björketorp stone (DR 360; Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 410–14): **baRutR**, 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. sing. pres. (cp. OIc *brýtr* ‘(he / she / it) breaks’; cp. Nielsen 2000: 291). While Isakson suggests that the inscription is not later than 550 (Isakson 2000: 17), Noreen (Noreen 1923: 375 no. 4) and Nielsen (Nielsen 2000: 261) date it to before 700 without further specification and Boutkan assigns it to the period c. 675 x 700 (Boutkan 1995: 38, with references). Isakson explains that runic evidence suggests that *i*-syncope (and hence *i*-umlaut phonemicization) had already been completed in the areas comprising today’s Sweden and Norway by 900 (Isakson 2000: 33–34). As far as the southern Scandinavian linguistic areas (i.e. today’s Denmark) are concerned, all we can say is that syncope after long syllables was completed in the sixth century, but we do not have enough evidence to date the completion of the process after short syllables. Yet, given that the process of syncope seems to have started in the southern Scandinavian area, we could infer that it had also been completed by 900.

<sup>24</sup> On the relationship between the Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and Owun’s glosses to the Rushworth Gospels (i.e. the so-called Rushworth 2), see below, 4.2.3 and II.168. Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 66) and Serjeantson (Serjeantson 1935: 64) say that the term is also recorded in the southern version of the Middle English *Romance of Octavian* (Sarrazin 1885) as ‘fleyne’ (ll. 1485 and 1671), but Ross explains (Ross 1939–40: 44–45) that the term actually reads ‘floyne’ (< OF *flouin* ‘a kind of small ship’).

tion of VAN /øy/ (cp. OIc *fley* ‘a kind of swift ship’),<sup>25</sup> <g> being a common choice for representing the front (or, fronted, as in this case) second component of Viking Age Norse diphthongs (cp. <eg> and <æg> for /ai/; see above, 2.2.1.1.B, and Thier 2009: 153). <oeg> might suggest that the Norse diphthong has been adapted as corresponding to the sequence /ø(:)j/ (cp. <woeg> vs WS *weg* ‘way’ or <tuoeg> vs WS *twēgen* ‘two’, both common spellings in Aldred’s and Owun’s glosses). <floeg> appears to be a nominative singular form, which makes the presence of *e* slightly difficult to explain. Ross’s suggestion (Ross 1939–40: 42–43) that the Old English term might derive from an oblique form (e.g. VAN gen. pl. \**fløya* < PGmc \**flaujōn*) seems particularly appealing,<sup>26</sup> although it might also be the case that, as suggested by Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §240), *e* represents a slight vocalic continuation of the palatal.

(B) OE *ȝre* / *ēre* ‘a Danish unit of account’: cp. OIc *eyrir* ‘an ounce of silver, or its amount in money’ < L *aureus* ‘golden’ (see above, 2.2.1.2.C). This term, which is only recorded in eleventh-century texts (see below, I.66.2), is the only reliable representation of the monophthongization of the Norse diphthong in English texts suggested by Luick (Luick 1964: §384.4) because his other example (viz. OE *fȝsian* / *fēsian* ‘to drive away’) is highly problematic (see below, III.1.2.A). The process exhibited by this term could be associated with the general tendency towards the monophthongization of diphthongs in late Old English (Hogg 1992: §§5.206–14).

(C) The presence of the Norse diphthong in OE *lȝsing* ‘freedman’ (cp. OIc *leysingi* / *leysingr* ‘freedman’) has been obscured by the association of the term with OE *lȝsan* ‘to loosen, release, redeem’ (see further below, 2.4.1.F; cp. 2.2.1.2.E).

<sup>25</sup> On OIc /ey/ as the reflex of VAN /øy/, see Noreen 1923: §§68.7 and 71.8.

<sup>26</sup> On VAN *a* as the ending for the genitive plural, see Noreen 1913: §191.7.



#### 2.2.1.4. PGmc \*/e:¹/ > NWGmc \*/a:/ > WS and Kt. /æ:/ and Angl. /e:/, or /o:/ when followed by a nasal vs OIc /a:/

(e.g. 1. NWGmc \**rāðanan* > OE *rēðan* ‘to advise, rule’ vs VAN *raþa* id., in ÖI. 1; Söderberg and Brate 1900–06: 14–37; cp. OIc *rāða*; 2. NWGmc \**kwāmun* > OE *c(w)ōmon* ‘came (pl.)’ vs VAN *kuamu* ‘[they] came’, in G 280; Snædal 2002: 53–60; cp. OIc *kvámu*).

The evolution of the so-called PGmc \*/e:¹/ is a trait that differentiates, in the first instance, East Germanic from North-West Germanic (see Antonsen 1994: 52, and Lehmann 1994: 23), and later on Old English and Old Frisian from the other West Germanic languages and from North Germanic. This difference is, however, neutralized in some contexts, such as when the vowel appears before /w/, in which case, West Saxon has /a:/ (see Hogg 1992: §§3.22–25).

Two of the terms attested in Old English texts whose Norse origin could be identified thanks to this feature contain the combination /a:N/, where *N* represents a nasal.<sup>27</sup> Even though NWGmc \*/a:/ had become /o:/ when followed by a nasal, Old English still allowed for the sequence /a:N/, for instance in the sequence PGmc \*/aiN/ > OE /a:N/) (e.g. OE *stān*, see above, 2.2.1.1). Therefore, the presence of /a:/ in the following term would not have been strange for Anglo-Saxon ears:

(A) OE *nām* ‘(legal) seizure, distraint’: cp. OIc *nām* ‘seizure, occupation’: cf. OE *nōmon* ‘[they] took’ < NWGmc \**nāmun*).<sup>28</sup>

The presence of /a:/ in two more terms may also be indicative of their Norse derivation:

(B) OE *grā* ‘grey’, attested as the determinant in the compound *grāscinnen* ‘made of grey skins or grey fur’: cp. OIc *grár* ‘grey’ and *gráskinn* ‘grey fur’ and ME *grā* / *grō* ‘a type of fur’ (see the MED: s.v. *grei*, n.2, the OED 1989: s.v. *gro*, and Dance 2003: 356). As noted by Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 89), though, we cannot ignore the possibility that, while OE *græg* ‘grey’ derives from NWGmc \**grāzaz*, OE *grā* may derive from the by-form \**grāwaz*, the etymon of the Germanic cognates of OE *græg* (see Orel 2003: s.v. *grēwaz*; cp. the OED 1989: s.v. *grey*, *gray*, a. and n.). See further below, 2.2.2.2.C.

<sup>27</sup> One case where there is no nasal is the by-name *hārfagera* ‘Hairfair’ (ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.30) for King Harold of Norway (cp. OIc *hár* vs OE *hær*).

<sup>28</sup> On the etymology of OE *nēm* ‘taking’ and (ge)*nēman* ‘to take away’, see A. Campbell 1959: §197 n. 4 and the OED (OED 2000–: s.v. *nimble*, a., adv., and n.). On <nēm> instead of <nam> in the version of LawIICn 19 recorded in London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero A.i and its bearing on the etymological interpretation of this term in the Wulfstanian canon, see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 50–53.

(C) OE 'H[A]NUM' in the Aldbrough inscription (= Inscr 1 (Ok 1)) could possibly be discussed here as well. NGmc *\*xānum* (< PGmc *\*xānomō*), the pronoun for the dative case of the third person singular masculine,<sup>29</sup> seems to have undergone what is generally known as 'combined labial umlaut (or mutation)', i.e. *\*/a:/\** has been affected by the combined presence of the nasal consonant and the back vowel (see also Benediktsson 1963: 426). Thus, the pronoun is likely to have gone through the following stages: *\*hānum* > *\*hōnum* > *hōnum* > *honum* (cp. OIc *honum*), following shortening in unaccented contexts (see Noreen 1913: §§35.a and 202.5, Heusler 1950: §75.2, Gordon 1957: §44, and Brøndum-Nielsen 1965: §567.3). The Viking Age Norse form with which Old English speakers might have come into contact is likely to have been pronounced with [ɔ:], with more or less rounding (on the 'younger' umlaut, see above, 1.6.2.1; cp. **hanum**, attested in various Viking Age runic inscriptions, e.g. DR 58; Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 96–97). This would account for the fact that the vowel is adapted as OE */ɑ:/\**, rounding not being a distinctive feature for the low-back long vowels either (see above, 1.6.2.1). We might have expected to find *\*hōnum* if the nasal consonant had already affected the vowel. As stated above, the inclusion of this term in the list of Norse-derived terms attested in texts written in Old English is not beyond doubt, though. The recorded form has also been interpreted as a possible late dative form with *um* instead of the expected *an* of the Old English by-name *hana* 'cock' (Stanley 1995: 11–13; see also Townend 2002: 191–92 n. 9).

### 2.2.1.5. PGmc *\*/anx/* > OE */o:x/* vs OIc */ɑ:x/*

(e.g. PGmc *\*fanxanan* > OE *fōn* 'to take' vs OIc *fǫ* id.).

Hogg (Hogg 1992: §3.14) explains that this change was late enough so as to prevent the vowel from taking part in the pan-Germanic merger of PIE *\*/a:/\** and *\*/o:/\**. However, in Old English and Old Frisian the nasalization which accompanied the loss of the consonant was retained and the vowel was rounded to */o:/\**. Only one word (viz. OE *hā*) can be clearly explained through the phonological evidence in this section, while evidence is not as clear as far as the OE *sahht* word-field is concerned:

(A) OE *hā* 'oar-thole, rowlock, rower?': < the Viking Age Norse term whose accusative singular is attested in the seventh-century Norwegian whetstone from Strøm as **haha** (< PGmc *\*xanx-*, cp. OIc *hár* 'oar-thole'; Noreen 1923:

<sup>29</sup> Cf. OE *him*; on the etymology of the North Germanic pronoun, see further Brøndum-Nielsen 1965: §567.



388 no. 68).<sup>30</sup> The form of the loan-word in Old English suggests that the final velar consonant may have been lost already by the time it was borrowed into Old English (Björkman 1900–02: 181). According to Noreen (Noreen 1923: §230.2), the earliest attested example of the typically North Germanic loss of final /x/ is recorded in the form **flu**, 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. sing. pret. ind., in DR 295, from c. 980 (Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 347–50; cp. OIc *fló* ‘[he/she/it] fled’, Go. *þlauh* id.).<sup>31</sup> The two attestations of the term in Old English texts as a simplex are slightly problematic, though. ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1040 records <ha> in the context where ChronD (Cubbin) 1040 = ChronE (Irvine) 1039 record *hamele* ‘rowlock’ (see below, 2.5.J). Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §340) and Thier (Thier 2002: 136) associate this context with OE *hā* but O’Brien O’Keeffe (O’Brien O’Keeffe 2001: 107 and n. 3 to that annal), the latest editor of the C-text, reconstructs in this context the same term as in the other versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (cp. Conner 1996: 15, s.a. 1040 n. 5). The will of Bishop Ælfwold of Crediton (c. 1008–12) records ‘hanon’, possibly referring to the Norse loan-word *scegð*: ‘æne scegð .lxiiii. ære. He is call gearo butan þam hanon he hine wolde ful gearwian his hlaforde to gerisnum gif him God uðe’ (Ch 1492 (Nap-Steven 10) 7–9). Both Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §340) and Thier (Thier 2002: 136) are also happy to include this context in the discussion of OE *hā*, but Hofmann points out that the presence of the middle nasal is difficult to account for because we would not expect to find an example of the Norse postponed article in early eleventh-century Devonshire (cf. Björkman 1900–02: 99 n. 1). Thier (Thier 2002: 106) suggests that the nasal should be associated with a by-form *\*hān*, but this form is not free from problems either. If we start with a form *\*xanx-* where the nasal is not lost, ‘hanon’ can be explained as a result of the Old English common loss of the velar fricative in voiced environments; the loss would have started in the inflected forms and would have spread to the nominative (see Hogg 1992: §7.45). Thus, we could reconstruct a native form *\*han*, which could have undergone later lengthening. Napier and Stevenson (Napier and Stevenson 1895: 128–29) hypothesize that the term might have been declined like a weak noun, which would make ‘hanon’ parallel to ‘tanum’ (cp. OE *tā* ‘toe’). However, they

<sup>30</sup> It is not clear which stem class this noun belonged to: Noreen gives this term as an example of *i*-stem nouns (Noreen 1923: §387), but de Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *hār*) derives it from *\*hanhu* (cp. Orel 2003: s.v. *\*xanxuz*), and Thier (Thier 2002: 106, 136) from *\*xanxa-* (cp. Jóhannesson 1956: s.v. *kak-*). The answer may lie in Lidén’s explanation that *i*-stem forms (cp. OIc *háir*, nom. pl.) seem to have replaced older *u*-stem forms (Lidén 1882: 89).

<sup>31</sup> The meanings of Gothic terms follow Lehmann 1986.

also suggest that ‘hanon’ could be taken as a by-form of OE *ānum*, with an inorganic <h>, according to which they translate *būtan þām ānum* as ‘except alone that, with the one exception that’ and the context where it appears as ‘it is quite complete, save alone that he would have fully equipped it in a fitting manner for his lord, had God granted it’.

It is therefore not clear whether the term has actually been recorded as a simplex in Old English texts. Yet it seems beyond reasonable doubt that it is attested as the determinant in the compound OE *hāsæta* ‘oarsman, rower’ (cp. OIc *háseti* ‘oarsman’, a term associated with OIc *hár* and *sitja* ‘to sit’; see de Vries 1961: s.v. *háseti*). The determinatum is likely to have been associated with the native *sēta*, *sēta* (e.g. OE *burgsæta* ‘town-dweller’, *endesæta* ‘border-watchman’, *landsēta* ‘settler’; cp. Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *sæta*).

(B) OE *sah̄t* (?) and its word-field:<sup>32</sup> In Old English there are various etymologically related terms belonging to the lexico-semantic field of agreement (see below, 3.4.2.2.E). They exhibit either <e> or <a> / <æ> in the root, and the etymological explanation of all of them remains problematic. The <e>-forms will be discussed first, and then the <a> / <æ>-forms will receive due attention.

The derivative OE *unsehtnes* ‘discord’ is already attested in the Vercelli Homilies (HomU 6 (ScraggVerc 15) 9).<sup>33</sup> Given that OE-*nes* is a suffix which forms deadjectival and deverbal abstract nouns (see Kastovsky 1992: 387), the term should be associated with OE *sehtan* ‘to reconcile’, which is recorded in LawIIEm 7 as <sectan>;<sup>34</sup> the verb could, in its turn, be associated with OE *seht* ‘reconciliation, agreement’ and *seht* ‘reconciled’. Even though a Norse origin for the members of the OE *seht* word-field has frequently been claimed (cp. OIc *sátt* ‘settlement, covenant, agreement’, *sætt* ‘reconciliation, agreement’, *sætta* ‘to reconcile’, and *sáttr* ‘reconciled, at peace’; see Robertson 1925: 297, n. to LawIIEm 7, Hofmann 1955: §207, de Vries 1961: s. v. *sætt*, and Peters 1981: 91), the early attestation and productivity of the word-field seem to argue instead in favour of its native origin (cp. Spargo 1940: 54). While it may be the case that the terms received some reinforcement from their Norse equivalents, various explanations for their native derivation can be put forward:

<sup>32</sup> On the presence of the interrogation mark after *sah̄t*, see below.

<sup>33</sup> Ker (Ker 1990: no. 394) assigns the Vercelli homiliary (Vercelli, Biblioteca Capitolare, MS CXVII) to the second half of the tenth century. Scragg (Scragg 1992: xxxix) suggests that most of the homilies in his edition should be attributed to a period between the late ninth and the late tenth centuries.

<sup>34</sup> On the problems associated with the date of this decree, see Wormald 1999: 310–11 and 377.

(B.1) Bammesberger (Bammesberger 1990: 145) and Orel (Orel 2003: s.v. *\*saxtiz*) would like to derive OE *seht* from PGmc *\*saxtiz* (cp. Go. *gasahts* ‘reproach, refutation’); accordingly, the verb should be associated with PGmc *\*saxtjanan* (cp. PGmc *\*sakanan* > OE *sacan* ‘to fight, strife, disagree’). If that is the case, the terms may represent (initially) non-West Saxon by-forms, with /e/ as the reflex of the *i*-umlauted diphthong derived from the breaking of OE *\*/æ/* (see A. Campbell 1959: §200.3, and Hogg 1992: §§5.3–14, 5.16–20, and 5.82). The West Saxon by-form of *seht* would have been *\*sieht* / *\*syht* / *\*siht* (cp. OE *insiht* ‘account, narrative’; see Lehmann 1986: s.v. *insahts*, and Bammesberger 1990: 145). Alternatively, the noun may have adopted the endings of an *a*- or an *ō*-stem noun very early (see Hogg 1992: §5.85.2);<sup>35</sup> thus, no *i*-umlaut would have taken place and the attested spellings may represent West Saxon palatal monophthongization of *\*/æa/* (see Hogg 1992: §5.119–23). The verb would then have become assimilated to the noun.

(B.2) It may be the case that, instead of being associated with PGmc *\*sakanan*, these terms should be brought together with its factitive by-form, PGmc *\*sōkjanan*. In that case, <e> representing the *i*-umlauted reflex of /o:/ would not be out of place in West Saxon texts (see Hogg 1992: §5.77; cp. OE *sēcan* ‘to search for, seek’). There is, of course, no way of knowing the length of the vowel in Old English texts and we may, in fact, be dealing with a root *sēht*; a long vowel may, however, have been shortened because of its position in front of a non-lengthening consonant cluster (cp. Dance 2003: 120–21).

The adjective OE *seht* is only recorded from the eleventh century onwards (see Hofmann 1955: §207). While it may be the case that its late attestation suggests Norse derivation, this etymological explanation, as with the other terms of the word-field, is by no means necessary. The term may simply represent an original past participle (cp. ‘þa ungesetan cristenan’ in HomU 53 (NapSunEpis) 45, a homily recorded in the early eleventh-century manuscript Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 162; cp. the *MED*: s.v. *saughten*, sense 2) or a denominal adjective (cp. Kastovsky 1992: 395).

Together with this word-field we find equivalent terms with <æ> and <a> from the eleventh century onwards. These terms are commonly attributed a Norse origin (see the *OED* 1989: s.vv. *saught*, n., *saught*, a., and *saught*, v., Townend 2002: 92, and Dance 2003: 372–73 and 382). Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 100) suggests that the Norse word-field represents PGmc *\*sanxt-* (> *\*sāxt*) and, accordingly, gives the lack of rounding in the root vowel as the

<sup>35</sup> The noun is attested as both a masculine and feminine noun (see Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *seht*).

reason for the Norse origin of the <æ> and <a> English by-forms. The Norse word-field seems to be associated with L *sacer* ‘sacred’, and L *sancire* ‘to hallow, make binding’ (see Jóhannesson 1956: s.v. *sak*);<sup>36</sup> thus, the presence of *n*, which could be analysed as an infix, in L *sancire* and other terms belonging to the same word-field makes the existence of PGmc *\*sanxt-* possible (see de Vries 1961: s.v. *sátr*, and de Vaan 2008: 532). However, this need not be the origin of the long vowel in the Norse word-field (cp. Heidermanns 1993: 459–60; see also Neumann 1953: 109–223) because vowels preceding *\*/xt/ > /tt/* were consistently lengthened in Old Norse (cp. WS *eahta* ‘eight’ vs OIc *átta* id.; see Noreen 1923: §124.1, and Brøndum-Nielsen 1950: §112). If the root is not attributed a nasal (cp. Go. *unsahataba* ‘indisputably’), the Norse origin of these by-forms has to rely on their late attestation and the fact that they are mainly restricted to the Peterborough Interpolations and Continuations, which are known for their high number of Norse-derived terms (see below, I.73 and IV.2.1.M), because, if we were looking for a native explanation, the forms with <æ> could be said to represent the non-*i*-umlauted reflex of PGmc *\*saxt-* which has undergone Anglian smoothing (see Hogg 1992: §5.93) and the use of <a> could be said to represent the fusion of OE /æ/ and /a/ in late Old English (see Hogg 1992: §§5.215–16). It seems, however, more likely that <æ> and <a> represent the Norse root vowels (cp. Dance 2003: 120–21, and Dance 2011: 102–03), although the possibility that <æ> in the Peterborough Interpolations and Continuations is a variant of <e> resulting from the confusion of /æ/, /e/, and /æa/ (see Irvine 2004: cviii–cx) cannot be ignored (cp. <sæhte> vs <sehte> in ChronE (Irvine) 1091.19 and 39, respectively). This is the reason why OE *sah*t (?) and the other members of its word-field are followed by a question mark.

It seems then that the lexical field representing this semantic field has native and Norse-derived forms, with <e> and <æ> / <a>, respectively.<sup>37</sup> It is important to reconstruct the Viking Age Norse terms the Old English speakers would have come across. If the word-field did indeed have a nasal, it was probably already lost during the Viking Age (cp. OE *hā*; see above, 2.2.1.5.A). Noreen (Noreen 1923: §267) suggests that the North Germanic process *\*/xt/ > /tt/* had already taken place by 900 (cp. *so*t, past participle, < PGmc *\*soxt-*, in the Norwegian Eggja stone, c. 700, transcribed by Noreen 1923: 377, no.

<sup>36</sup> See also Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *sāg*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *sett*, and the OED 1989: s.v. *saught*, v.

<sup>37</sup> The dichotomy /e/ ~ /a/ might be attested as well in the Middle English texts, and it is therefore not necessary to suppose that <e> represents /æ/ > /e/ in the dialect behind London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero A.xiv (cf. Dance 2003: 120–21).

14; cp. OIc *sótt* 'sought, attacked', cf. OE *gesōht* id.; cf. Kolb 1962: 307–08).<sup>38</sup> Although Kolb (Kolb 1962) tries to push the date later to, at least, the middle of the twelfth century by relying on the apparent lack of assimilation in the Old Norse loan-words in Old English, Roe (Roe 1967) points out that the Anglo-Saxon spelling could be interpreted as an attempt to show the preaspiration with which the cluster <tt> would have been pronounced in Old Norse, a pronunciation still found in Icelandic and Faroese (cp. the Norse loan *ünsächt* in Northern Frisian; Hofmann 1955: §207).<sup>39</sup> These two sound changes imply the presence of a long vowel in the Viking Age Norse form, which was also likely to have undergone *i*-umlaut in some cases; thus, we could reconstruct a word-field represented by the Viking Age Norse forms *\*sét* and *\*sát*.

The presence of the liquid in OE *sahlian* (?) 'to reconcile, come to an agreement' is difficult to explain, but it is likely to have developed by analogy with other verbs (e.g. OE *setlan* 'to settle, cause to sit, place, put'; on the association of the two verbs, see the *MED*: s.v. *saughtelen*; cp. *tihthan* 'to accuse, charge' and *tihthlian* id.).

#### 2.2.1.6. North Germanic lowering and lengthening of \*/u/ to /o:/ after loss of nasal

While the loss of a nasal consonant in front of /x/ was a common Germanic process, the various Germanic languages followed different paths regarding the combination of a nasal with another consonant. In North Germanic, the loss of a nasal was accompanied by the lengthening and lowering of the preceding vowel, whereas in Old English lowering did not take place (e.g. OE *mūð* 'mouth' < PGmc *\*munhaz*). Besides in the personal name *Pórr* (< PGmc *\*þunraz*; cf. OE *Ðunor*; see further below, III.1.11.D),<sup>40</sup> the effects of this sound change can be observed in OE *toft* 'homestead, site of a house'.<sup>41</sup> It is likely to

<sup>38</sup> Cp. *trutin*, acc. sing., in DR 209 (Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 248–53) < PGmc *\*ðruxtīnaz*, cp. OIc *dróttin* 'lord'; cf. OE *dryhten* id.

<sup>39</sup> On the process of assimilation in Old Norse and its representation in Old English texts, see also Lehisté's discussion on the personal name *Ohter* in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Lehisté 1958: 15).

<sup>40</sup> On the dialectal differences between *Pórr* and *Þúrr*, see Björkman 1901: 25, and Townend 2002: 139–40, with references.

<sup>41</sup> In Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 8 and 44 the term is recorded as 'tuft', which could be taken as an indication of the existence of a native cognate. However, <u> for <o> may simply be attributable to the late date of the manuscript where it is recorded (s. xiii<sup>2</sup>; see below, II.156) and to the fact that Middle English texts sometimes record shortened /o:/ as <u> so as to show that it contrasted with /o/, which had become more open (Jordan 1974: §35 Remark 2).

derive from VAN *\*toft* or *\*tōft* (< PGmc *\*tumftō*, according to de Vries 1961: s.v. *topt*, *tupt*, *tomt*, cp. OIc *topt*, *tupt* ‘homestead; a place marked out for a house or a building; the mere walls or foundations of a (former) building’; see further Holmberg 1946 and Gammeltoft 2001: 18–19).<sup>42</sup> The etymon may have undergone shortening already by the time of borrowing or the process may have happened independently in the two languages (see Björkman 1900–02: 113, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *toft*, the *MED*: s.v. *toft*, Hofmann 1955: §212, de Vries 1961: s.v. *topt*, *tupt*, *tomt*, Peters 1981: 98, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *toft*, n.1).<sup>43</sup> The dialectal distribution of the term in Old English texts, as well as its use as a place-name formative, may also be suggestive of its Norse origin (see below, 3.4.2.9.C; cp. Hofmann 1955: §212; see also A. Wall 1898: 125, the *EDD*: s.v. *toft*, Thorson 1936: 51, and Gammeltoft 2003: 45–46 and 50–63).

### 2.2.1.7. PGmc *\*/a/* > OE */æ/* vs OIc */ɑ/*

(e.g. PGmc *\*was* > OE *wes* ‘[he/she/it] was’ vs the Viking Age Norse verbal form attested as **uas**, 3<sup>rd</sup> per. sing. pret. ind., in Ög. 68, Ög. 77, **uar** in Ög. 184 and **uar** in Ög. 94, Ög. 105, Sö. 14, etc. (Brate 1911–18: 69–70, 78–79, 178, 93–95, and 105–06, and Brate and Wessén 1924–36: 9–10, respectively; cp. OIc *var*)

The process known as ‘first fronting’ (or ‘Anglo-Frisian brightening’), according to which PGmc *\*/a/* > */æ/* in most positions (except when the vowel was nasalized), differentiates Old English and Old Frisian from the other Germanic languages (see Hogg 1992: §§5.10–15). Thus, the absence of this feature can be used as further phonological evidence in favour of the Norse origin of a term. It can be applied to the following terms:

(A) OE *māl* ‘suit, cause, action, agreement, covenanted pay’: In North Germanic there is a general tendency towards the loss of *\*/θ/* in front of */l/*, which causes lengthening of the previous vowel (Noreen 1923: §236), whereas the general tendency in Old English is towards dissimilation (i.e. *\*/θl/* > */tl/*), with only a few words showing loss of */θ/* and lengthening of the previous vowel, especially in West Saxon (Hogg 1992: §§7.10–11). While WS *māl* ‘speech, conversation’ and *mælan* ‘to speak, talk’ represent some of these cases (< PGmc *\*maþlan* and *\*maþljanan*; cp. nWS *mæðel* and *mæðlan*), the different

<sup>42</sup> Orel gives the etymon of the Norse term instead as *\*tumf(e)tiz* (Orel 2003: s.v. *\*tumf(e)tiz*); an initially *i*-stem noun could have become assimilated to the *ō*-stem nouns (see Heusler 1950: §§216–18).

<sup>43</sup> Ridel explains that the term was borrowed as well into the *langue d’oïl* as *tot* / *topt* ‘homestead’ (Ridel 2004: 156).



character of the vowel in OE *māl* suggests that it should be associated instead with the Viking Age Norse noun recorded as the determinant of the compound **mal:s[b]aka** ‘wise-spoken’, acc. sing., in U 1146 (Wessén and B. F. Jansson 1940–58: IV, 566–69; cp. OIc *mál* ‘speech, stipulation, case’, *máli* ‘contract, agreement, wages’, and *málsþakr* ‘wise-spoken’; but see Björkman 1900–02: 103, with references). Besides appearing as a simplex (e.g. in the seemingly Norse-derived phrases OE *beran ūp māl* ‘to set forth (one’s) case’ and *scylian of mǣle* ‘to discharge from service’; cp. OIc *bera upp mál* ‘to bring forth a case, to state the grounds for an action’ and OIc *skilja af máli* ‘to terminate a relationship of service’; see W. H. Stevenson 1887: 334–35, Björkman 1900–02: 103, Olszewska 1933: 79 and 83, Serjeantson 1935: 73, Hofmann 1955: §§352 and 368, and below, III.1.7.D),<sup>44</sup> the term can also be found in the following compounds:<sup>45</sup>

(A.1) *formāl(a)* / *formǣl* ‘negotiation, agreement’: The term is once attested as <formæl> (LawSwer 1; cp. *formǣlan* in Ch Thomas (Liebermann) 8; see below, IV.2.1.E) and once as <(ðam) formalan> (LawIIAtr 1), which could be interpreted as a dative plural form (it is rendered by L ‘elocutiones’, cp. L *elocutio* ‘speech, utterance’, in the *Quadripartitus* version of the code; see Liebermann 1903–16: I, 220) or as a dative singular form. The latter would suggest the existence of a weak noun \**formāla*. This variation may go back to the existence of Viking Age Norse forms with [æ:] and [a:] side by side (cp. OIc *formali* and *formáli* ‘stipulation, foreword’) or it may show the assimilation of the second component to WS *mǣl* (cp. *sammǣle*; see below, 2.2.1.7.A.5).

(A.2) *fríðmāl* ‘article of peace’ (cp. OIc *fríðmál* ‘words of peace’).

(A.3) *mǫldæg* ‘agreement, covenant’: It is only attested in the seemingly Norse-derived alliterative phrase *mund and mǫldæg* (cp. OIc *mundr ok mǫldagi* ‘the sum which the bridegroom had to pay for his bride and an agreement’; see Whitelock 1930: 195 n. to l. 6, Olszewska 1933: 83, Olszewska 1928–36: 237, and Hofmann 1955: 323; see also below, 2.4.1.G).<sup>46</sup>

(A.4) *viðermāl* ‘counter-plea, defence’: It is only attested in the Norse-derived phrase *cuman tō viðermǣle* (cp. ODa. *koma til viðrmales* ‘to make one’s

<sup>44</sup> Despite mentioning that the phrase is ‘very Scandinavian-looking’, Denison explains that OE *ūp* in this context can be associated with a common use of the adverb in Old English, viz. referring to something being ‘disclosed, made known’ (Denison 1985: 39 and 54). On OE *settan of mǣle*, see below, III.4.LLL.

<sup>45</sup> For compounds with this term attested in post-Old English texts, see the *OED* 2000–: s.v. *mail*, n.<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>46</sup> For examples of the Norse formula, see, for instance, Gul. 25 and 27.

counter-plea', which is recorded in a fifteenth-century manuscript of the Jutish Law, viz. MS A<sup>15</sup> in *DGL*: II; see Steenstrup 1882: 181, Olszewska 1933: 79 and 84, and Hofmann 1955: §359).<sup>47</sup>

(A.5) Another compound which, despite not being formed with OE *māl*, should be discussed in this section because of its association with the word-field under discussion is OE *sammæle* 'agreed, accordant'. The compound is generally identified as a Norse-derived term and compared with OIc *sammeli* / *sammáli* 'agreement' and *sammáli* / *sammála* 'agreeing' (see Steenstrup 1882: 215 n. 1, Hofmann 1955: §263, and Peters 1981: 91). Given that all the attestations of the term have <æ>, we cannot discount the possibility that the term is in fact a native compound with the not uncommon determinant *sam-* (cp. OE *samwist* 'cohabitation', *samwædnes* 'union, cohabitation', etc.) and with OE *mæl* as the determinatum. Indeed, native derivation may be particularly fitting to the attestation of the term in a late tenth- or early eleventh-century charter from St Augustine's, Canterbury (viz. Ch 1455 (Rob 62); see below, II.135). However, given that, as explained above, the loss of /θ/ in front of /l/ and the lengthening of the vowel are mainly characteristic of West Saxon while the first attestations of the adjective are recorded in some texts which cannot be easily associated with the West Saxon dialectal area (see below, 3.3.3), the identification of the determinatum with the native term may be problematic. The Norse-derived character of the term may also be suggested by the fact that we do not otherwise have an attested adjective *\*mæle* in Old English.

All the compounds have an equivalent Norse form, and it is indeed very likely that they were borrowed ready-made. However, it seems clear that the similarity between the native and the Norse simplexes and the fact that Old English also had other compounds with a similar structure (e.g. OE *forbod* 'prohibition', *friddorb* 'surety for peace', *mældæg* 'day, season, appointed time', *widercwide* 'contradiction, opposition', and *samheort* 'unanimous') facilitated the introduction and accommodation of the Norse-derived word-field.

(B) OE *walrēaf* 'spoil from the slain, the act of spoiling the slain': The determinant in the compound seems to represent, not OE *wel* 'slaughter, dead body', but rather the Viking Norse Age cognate (< PGmc *\*walaz*). The latter is recorded in the compound **ualraubar**, nom. pl., in Ög. 136 (Bugge 1910b and Brate 1911–18: 130; cp. OIc *valrauf* 'plundering of the slain').<sup>48</sup> We should not

<sup>47</sup> The other manuscripts of the code have the synonymous expression ODa. *koma til gen-mel* instead (JL II.107).

<sup>48</sup> It is difficult to know whether the initial consonant in the Norse term was pronounced as



forget, however, that, given that the loan-word is only recorded once, the term may in fact represent the native compound, and the presence of <a> instead of <æ> may be associated, rather than with any Norse influence, with the fact that the tract where it is recorded, viz. *Walreaf*, is only extant in post-Conquest legal collections, where the use of <a> for <æ> is not uncommon (see Wormald 1999: 236.53, and Hogg 1992: §§5.215–16; see also below, II.216).

**2.2.1.8. PGmc \*/ax/ and \*/arC/ > OE /æax/ (or /æ:a/) and /æarC/ vs OIc \*/ax/ (or /a:/) and /urC/**

(e.g. PGmc \**slaxanan* > OE *slēan* ‘to strike’ vs OIc *slá* id.; PGmc \**þarþōjanan* > OE *ðearfian* ‘to be in need’ vs OIc *þarfa* ‘to need, want’)

The lack of representation of the sound change known as ‘breaking’ in Old English terms tends to be considered as an indication of foreign origin (see Hogg 1992: §§5.16–27). However, as noted already by Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 101), this is not a fully reliable feature because breaking was a complex process that was not carried out to the same effect in all dialectal areas. First of all, restoration of /a/ seems to have occurred earlier than breaking in the North-East at least in some cases, according to which we find Nb. *slā(n)* vs WS *slēan* ‘to strike, beat’ (cp. ‘to slanne’ as a gloss for L *occidendus*, cp. L *occidere* ‘to strike’, in OccGl 49 (Zupitza) 22.13; see A. Campbell 1959: §145 n. 2, and Hogg 1992: §§5.10–15 and 5.38; see also below, III.1.5.D). Secondly, the effects of breaking may not be visible because of a series of changes:

- (1) the effects of combinative breaking and ‘the occurrence of combinative breaking outside its normal limits’ (see Hogg 1992: §5.20 n. 3; e.g. ‘maht’ in PsGlA (Kuhn) 61.12, and ‘almahtig’ in OccGl 54 (Zupitza) 12.60 and 13.115 vs WS *meaht*, *miht* ‘stength, power’);<sup>49</sup>
- (2) Anglian smoothing (e.g. ‘neh’ in MtGl (Li) 13.1 vs WS *nēah* ‘near’; Hogg 1992: §§5.93–102); and
- (3) palatal monophthongization (e.g. eWS *eahta* vs ‘ehta’ in Lk (WSCp) 2.21; see Hogg 1992: §§5.119–23).

With these caveats in mind, we can now discuss the terms recorded in Old English texts where lack of breaking may suggest Norse origin:

[w] or [b]. Noreen 1913: §56 suggests that /w/ was pronounced as a bilabial by the end of the Viking Age; this change allowed for the later integration of the sound into the phoneme /v/.

<sup>49</sup> On the ‘normal limits’ of combinative breaking, see Hogg 1992: §§5.28–34, especially §5.29.

(A) OE *barð* ‘type of ship’ and *barða* id.:<sup>50</sup> These terms are only recorded in the eleventh-century glosses to Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum, MS 47 + London, British Library, MS Add. 32246 (Ker 1990: no. 2) and the derivative glossary in Brussels, Royal Library, MS 1828–30 (Ker 1990: no. 9),<sup>51</sup> where they render L *dromo* (< Gr. *δρόμων* ‘light vessel’), presented either by itself or as part of a lemma referring to a ram-ship (see below, 3.4.2.5.A and I.5). The terms are likely to derive from two Viking Age Norse reflexes of PGmc *\*barð-* (< PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>ord<sup>h</sup>-*), which Orel (Orel 2003: s.v. *burðan*) analyses as an ablaut variant of PGmc *\*burð-* (< PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>rd<sup>h</sup>-*, see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *bheredh-*; cp. OE *bord* / OIc *borð* ‘board, plank’); cp. OIc *barð* ‘edge, brim’, which seems to have originally referred to some part of the stem but often refers to the whole of it (see Jesch 2001b: 148), and *barði* ‘a sort of ship’, which is likely to derive from OIc *barð* and may initially have referred to a ship with a special stem (see Simek 1982: 62–63, and Thier 2002: 128). The fact that the Old English terms are attested with lack of breaking does not necessarily mean that they had not exhibited breaking before because the spelling might represent IOE /æa/ > /æ/ > /a/ (see Hogg 1992: §§5.212 and 5.215–16). However, given that lack of breaking is supplemented by the presence of <ð> and <þ> for the expected <d> (although <barda> is recorded; see below, 2.2.2.3.A),<sup>52</sup> we seem to be entitled to suggest that we are dealing with Norse-derived loan-words.

(B) OE *carl* ‘man’: < the Viking Age Norse noun attested as **karl**, nom. sing., in Ög. 81 (Brate 1911–18: 80–83; cp. OIc *karl* ‘man’ < PGmc *\*karlaz*; cf. OE *ceorl* ‘man, freeman of the lowest class’, an ablaut variant, i.e. < PGmc *\*kerlaz*; see Orel 2003: s.v. *\*karlaz*).<sup>53</sup> The term seems to have become well integrated in Old English relatively quickly; we never find it as a simplex, but rather as part of various compounds, at least one of which is likely to represent an English new formation:

<sup>50</sup> Thier defines these terms more specifically as a ‘Mediterranean ship with a ram’ (Thier 2002: 128).

<sup>51</sup> On the relationship between these glossaries, see below, II.6.

<sup>52</sup> Simmonds suggests that ‘barda’ may be ‘an error (or an archaism?) for *barða*’ (Simmonds 1984: 57–58 n. 28). On the somewhat common confusion of <d> and <ð> in Anglo-Saxon manuscripts, see, for instance, Stanley 2002, and Godden and Irvine 2009: 1, 164. See also below, 2.2.2.3.A.

<sup>53</sup> However, the Norse-derived loan-word *karilas* in Finnish suggests a Proto-Germanic ground form *\*karilaz*. The by-forms *\*karlaz* and *\*karilaz* are paralleled by the suggested Proto-Germanic variants *\*erlaz* and *\*erilaz* (cp. OIc *jarl* ‘high-born nobleman or warrior, earl’; see de Vries 1961: s.vv. *jarl* and *karl*). Syrett suggests that ‘as a tentative stop-gap measure it is possible that specifically in the sequence *\*-r-ila-* the phonotactic attractiveness of *\*-rla-* sometimes led to abnormally early medial syncope’ (Syrett 1994: 171).

(B.1) OE *būtsecarl* ‘boatman’, where the first element is likely to represent a ship type (cp. ML *buza*, *bucia*, OIc *búza*, OHG *búzo*, etc.; > OFr. *bucecarl* ‘seaman’; see Sayers 2003: 303–09). While the etymology of the determinant in the compound is not clear at all,<sup>54</sup> the whole compound might have been coined as follows: once Old English speakers had become familiar with OE *būscarl* (on which see below, 2.2.1.8.B.4), they analysed it as ‘a *carl* who works at or in connection with a *būs*’. This would have left the doors open for the creation of structurally similar compounds, OE *būtsecarl* being one of them. The facts that the term is first attested in mid-eleventh-century annals of the *Abingdon Chronicle* (see below, I.10.1) and that it is not used in association with the Scandinavian newcomers,<sup>55</sup> but may refer instead to ‘the inhabitants of the maritime towns of Kent and Sussex, some of whom owed naval service to the king’ (Hooper 1992b: 21; see below, 3.4.2.3.A), do not belie this suggestion. However, the facts that the simplex OE *carl* is not recorded in texts from outside the Scandinavianized areas until the late Middle English period (see the *MED*: s.v. *carl*), that no other structurally parallel compounds with OE *carl* as the determinatum are recorded in Old and Middle English texts, and that OE *būscarl* may have retained its association with the Scandinavians (or foreigners in general) during Edward the Confessor’s reign (see below, 3.4.2.6.A.4) could be taken as evidence against this etymological explanation.

(B.2) OE *carlfugol* ‘male bird’ (cp. OIc *karlfugl* ‘male bird’);

(B.3) OE *carlmann* ‘person of the male gender’ (OIc *karlmaðr* ‘man, male’);<sup>56</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Fischer suggests that OIc *búza* is a loan-word either from Old English or Latin (F. Fischer 1909: 47; cp. Falk and Torp 1910–11: s.v. *byse*), while de Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *búza*) prefers to consider that OE *būtse* is a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. Simek 1982: 79). De Vries hypothesizes that the Norse etymon is itself a loan-word from Low German (cp. MLG *bútze*, *búse*), which, in its turn, was a Latin loan-word (cp. Höfler 1932: 221, and Simek 1982: 51 and 78–79; cp. OHG *búzo*; see Lloyd and others 1988–: s.v. *búzo*). This contradicts the analysis of the Latin term by Niermeyer and others (Niermeyer and others 2002: s.v. *busa*), because they consider it to be a Norse-derived term. For an argument in favour of the non-Norse origin of the term, see further Sayers 2003: 306–08.

<sup>55</sup> We should note, though, that Sayers hypothesizes that the institution represented by the term may have actually ‘originated in the Danelaw on a Danish model during Godwine’s tenure under both Cnut and Edward and was then extended to the remainder of England’ (Sayers 2003: 308).

<sup>56</sup> OE *ceorlmann* is only recorded with the meaning ‘man with the rank of a *ceorl*’; it seems to be a late Old English compound (see the *DOE*: s.v. *ceorl-mann*). On the common use of OIc *karl* to form compounds referring to a male being, see Pons-Sanz 2007e.

(B.4) OE *hūscarl* ‘member of the king’s or a nobleman’s household’ (cp. OIc *húskarl* ‘man-servant, a man in the king’s body-guard’).<sup>57</sup>

The existence of a native near-cognate and the Anglo-Saxons’ familiarity with Charlemagne’s name (attested as <carl> in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, e.g. ChronA (Bately) 812 = ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 811 = ChronD (Cubbin) 812) might have contributed to the quick integration of the term.

(C) OE *marc* is generally accepted to be a loan-word based on the Viking Age Norse noun recorded as **marka**, acc. pl., in Vg. 4 (Jungner and Svårdström 1940–71: 6–10, cp. OIc *mork* ‘by weight or value, = eight ounces’; see Hofmann 1955: §§202 and 341, de Vries 1961: s.v. *mork*, Peters 1981: 95, and Kisbye 1982a: 66). The term is only attested with <ea> in one of the versions of LawAGu 2, extant in the twelfth-century manuscript Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 383 (Ker 1990: no. 65; see Liebermann 1903–16: I, 126). Thus, the spelling could represent the influence of the Old English spelling tradition (cp. OE *cnearr*; see below, 2.4.1.A),<sup>58</sup> the confusion of <a>, <æ>, <ea>, and <e> by twelfth-century scribes (cp. Irvine 2004: cviii–cx and cxiv–cxvi), or a dittograph, given that the Norse-derived term appears as the determinatum of the compound OE *healfmarc*.

Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 250) supports the Norse origin of OE *marc* by suggesting that it refers to a coin introduced by the Scandinavians; however, the term did not refer to any coin in Anglo-Saxon England but to a denomination of weight and money of account (see Malmer 1974: 6–7, Kisbye 1982a: 66–70, Nightingale 1983, Nightingale 1984, and Engeler 1991: 115–27). The mark appears to have been common throughout Western Europe from the eleventh century (cp. OFris. *merk*, MHG and MLG *mark*, ML *marca*, *marcus*), which may undermine the significance of any cultural reason behind its identification as a Norse-derived term. However, it is likely that this unit was introduced into Western Europe from England, thanks to the latter’s significant role in European trade during the late tenth and eleventh centuries (see Steenstrup 1882: 171–72, Kisbye 1982a: 66, Nightingale 1985, Engeler 1991: 115–16, and Griepentrog 1995: 265–85; see further below, 3.4.2.4.A). Steenstrup summarizes its association with the Scandinavian newcomers in English texts:

<sup>57</sup> On the use of the term as a by-name, mainly recorded in the Domesday Book, see Tengvik 1938: 255–56. On the Old Norse term, see further von See 1981 and Klingenberg 1991.

<sup>58</sup> Cp. OE *mearc* ‘mark, boundary’. The native term is commonly replaced by the Norse cognate in the place-name *Denemearc* ‘Denmark’ in post-1000 entries in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (e.g. ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1037.2 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1037.3); yet Wulfstan’s account in the Old English Orosius still shows a tendency towards the adaptation of the term (see Or 1 1.16.16, 1.16.20, and 1.16.25).

Since this money of account occurs for the first time in the agreement between Alfred and Guthrum c. 2 (8 *healfmearc ásodenes goldes*), since it is afterwards mainly used in the Danish district, and since the mark appears divided into oras, it can hardly be denied that we are here faced with a Danish loan-word. (Steenstrup 1882: 172)<sup>59</sup>

(D) The term *rān*, as recorded in a Latin text from the time of William the Conqueror (LawWlArt 6; Liebermann 1903–16: I, 487),<sup>60</sup> can be associated with the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *rán* ‘robbery, plundering’ (< PGmc *\*raxnaz*), according to de Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *rán*; cp. Steenstrup 1882: 342, Björkman 1900–02: 102, and Peters 1981: 90).<sup>61</sup> Yet the term could be said to represent instead a case similar to Nb. *slā(n)*, where restoration of /a/ has taken place before breaking (see above, 2.2.1.8). Indeed, the native origin of the noun may be suggested by the existence of OHG *birahanen* ‘to carry off, capture’, cognate with OIc *ræna* ‘to commit *rán*’ (< PGmc *\*raxnjanan*).<sup>62</sup> However, the attestation of the term in Old English texts makes this suggestion highly problematic.

The information suggested by the term’s form can be supplemented by its late attestation and the possible direct semantic correspondence between OE *rān*, as explained by the laws of William the Conqueror (‘*ran, quod Angli dicunt apertam rapinam, quę negari non potest*’, LawWlArt 6), and the Norse term,<sup>63</sup> which is generally distinguished from OIc *stuldr* and *þýfð* ‘theft’ as

<sup>59</sup> ‘Da nu denne Møntberegning første Gang fremkomer i Alfred og Guthrums Forlig c. 2 (8 *healfmearc ásodenes goldes*), da den derefter især benyttes i de danske Egne, og da Marken viser sig delt i Øre, kan det næppe bestrides, at vi her staa overfor et dansk Laan.’

<sup>60</sup> On this text, see Wormald 1999: 402–03.

<sup>61</sup> On the etymology of the Norse noun, see further Bjorvand and Lindeman 2007: s.v. *ran*.

<sup>62</sup> See, however, above, 2.1, for a caveat against using the existence of West Germanic cognates as evidence in favour of the native derivation of an Old English term as opposed to its Norse-derived character.

<sup>63</sup> Cleasby and Vigfusson record that the word has a more general sense in the singular than in the plural: singular ‘any unlawful seizure or holding of property’ and plural ‘robbery, plundering’ (Cleasby and Vigfusson 1957: s.v. *rán*). The general meaning of the term may be found in the noun ‘*ryðrenan*’ in ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.27, as suggested by Steenstrup (Steenstrup 1882: 342). He associates this term with OIc *raudā rān*, which he interprets as some sort of robbery in which blood was involved (cp. Dennis and others 1980–2000: II, 179 n. 8). However, it is more likely that the term is a slip for ‘*þa norðrenan*’, even though the latest editor has not emended it (see Cubbin 1996: 78). This would bring the D-text closer to the E-text, which reads ‘*þa norðerne men*’ (ChronE (Irvine) 1064.15; cp. Whitelock and others 1965: 138, and Swanton 2000: 193 n. 9). On the possible association of the general sense with LawIICn 61.1,

something done openly and secretly, respectively.<sup>64</sup> Direct semantic correspondence, however, depends on attributing to ‘apertam’ the same meaning as PDE *open*, i.e. on considering that the crime was committed by daylight and often through violent means. The Latin clarification could be associated with OE *open* *ðȳfð* (LawIICn 26.1, 64) instead, because Schwyter explains that OE *open* in this collocation should rather be understood as ‘manifest’ or ‘evident’, i.e. as referring to a crime which, as in the Latin explanation, cannot be denied (Schwyter 1996: 126–27). Even so, evidence in favour of interpreting ‘apertam’ as PDE *open* comes from the same decree in the Conqueror’s laws because it differentiates ‘ran’ from *L furtum*, which, according to Schwyter (Schwyter 1996: 158), is the Latin term which corresponds to OE *ðȳfð* (and OE *stalu*; see Schwyter 1996: 156). The date and the semantics of the term then argue as well in favour of attributing it a Norse-derived character. Besides as a simplex, the term appears to have been recorded as well in the purely Wulfstanian compound OE *cýricrēn* ‘sacrilege’ in LawVIATR 28.3 (on the presence of /e:/, see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 55–56).

## 2.2.2. Consonants

### 2.2.2.1. PGmc \*/g/ and /k/ in contact with a front vowel > OE /j/ or [ɰ] and /k/ or [tʃ] vs OIc /g/ and /k/

(e.g. PGmc \**ðazaz* > OE *dæg* ‘day’ vs OIc *dagr* id.; PGmc \**lagjanan* > OE *lecgan* ‘to lay’ vs VAN *lekia* id., attested in Ög. 213 and Sm. 94; Brate 1911–18: 201–02, and Kinander 1935–61: 222; cp. OIc *leggja*)

Hogg (Hogg 1992: §§7.15–39) explains that, at a very early stage in the history of English, the velar consonants /x, k, g/ became sensitive to an adjacent front vowel (excluding the front vowels derived from *i*-umlaut) and the approximant /j/. The palatal stops eventually developed into affricates, although whether this took place during the Old English period or early during the Middle English period is still a matter of dispute (see Hogg 1992: §7.36, and Minkova 2003: ch. 3). For this reason the affricate consonants in the explanation above have been represented as sounds rather than as phonemes. Old Norse was not affected by this process; therefore, this is another feature that can be taken into consideration for the identification of Norse-derived terms. However, Old

see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 54–55 n. 35.

<sup>64</sup> On this distinction, see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 55 n. 36.



English scribes did not always distinguish clearly between palatalized and non-palatalized phonemes or allophones, which complicates matters.<sup>65</sup>

As far as Norse-derived terms attested in Old English are concerned, there are four words for which this feature can be given as an indication of Norse origin:<sup>66</sup>

(A) OE *ceallian* ‘to call, shout’: cp. OIc *kalla* ‘to cry, shout’ (< PGmc \**kalzōjanan*; cp. OFris *kella* ‘to name’, OHG *kallôn* ‘to talk’).<sup>67</sup> Given that ME \**challen* is not attested, <ea> is likely to be the result of the influence of West Saxon orthography, which would favour a representation of breaking in such position (see Björkman 1900–02: 215, and Dance 1999: 145–46).

(B) OE (*ge*)*eggian* ‘to egg on, incite’: This verb is only recorded in Old English texts in the glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels (see below, I.25; cp. Ross 1982: 197). Even though we cannot know how it was pronounced during the Old English period, the velar pronunciation for the voiced stop is already attested in the *Ormulum* (see Napier 1894: 71–72). This suggests that we are dealing with a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *eggja* ‘to incite’ < PGmc \**azjōjanan*; cf. OE *ecgan* ‘to sharpen’).

(C) OE *gærsu(m)a* ‘jewel, costly thing, treasure’: The velar consonant in its pronunciation (cp. Dance 2003: 79) and the late attestation of the term in Old English texts (see below, I.35) are the main indications of the Norse origin of the term (cp. OIc *gersemi* ‘costly thing, treasure’, which is also attested as *gørsemi*, *gersimi*, and *gørsimi*, < PGmc \**zarwja-* + \**samīn*; cp. OE *gearu* / OIc *gørr* ‘ready’ < PGmc \**zarwaz*). The vowel /æ/ is likely to represent VAN /æ/, resulting from the *i*-umlaut of PGmc \*/a/. The term is also attested in Old English with <e>, which can be explained in different ways:

(C.1) The mid vowel may represent the closest equivalent which Old English speakers could find in their phonological repertoire to VAN [ø], the reflex of *u*-umlauted /æ/. This statement would apply mainly to those speakers belonging to dialectal areas where OE /ø/ was commonly unrounded to /e/, i.e. West Saxon and Kentish (this process was more limited in Anglian; see Hogg 1992:

<sup>65</sup> On the problems of relying on lack of palatalization to identify Norse-derived terms in English, see further Ramisch 1997.

<sup>66</sup> On the applicability of this criterion to OE *dreng*, see below, 2.4.2.E.

<sup>67</sup> Orel is careful not to mention OE *ceallian* amongst the reflexes of the Proto-Germanic root (Orel 2003: s.v. \**kalzōjanan*); this decision may, however, respond to an attempt to avoid controversy rather than to an implied acceptance of the Norse origin of the Old English verb.

§5.77; cp. Lass 1992a). According to this explanation, the different spellings in Old English may go back to different by-forms in Viking Age Norse.

(C.2) Given that the term is only recorded in late Old English, <e> may be a spelling variant of <æ>. <e>-forms are recorded in the E-text of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, the *Lives of St Nicolas* and *St Giles*, and Ch 1476 (Rob 114); confusion of <e> and <æ> is common in the first three texts (see Treharne 1997: 68, with references) and that may be the situation as well in Ch 1476 (Rob 114), which records <deg> for OE *dæg* 'day' (Ch 1476 (Rob 114) 10). Treharne (Treharne 1997: 67) suggests that the spelling <e> for the Norse-derived term in the two aforementioned *Lives* may actually represent Kentish influence; accordingly, the spelling <gyrsum(e)> in LS 9 (Giles) 59 and 147 could be interpreted as an erroneous restoration of <y>, <e> for <y> being very common in Kentish and in these *Lives* in particular (Treharne 1997: 67).

The term is most frequently recorded with the suffix *-sum*, which represents an ablaut variant of PGmc *\*-samaz*; its presence in the Old English term could be explained as a result of the fact that Old English speakers borrowed it from Old Danish (cp. ODa. *gørsum*), or as a result of the substitution of this common Old English suffix for the Norse equivalent (cp. Dance 2003: 355).

The Old Norse term is a feminine *in*-stem noun (Noreen 1923: §411), whereas the Old English term is declined as both a weak noun (e.g. 'gærsuman' in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065.11) and a strong *a*-stem noun (e.g. 'gersumas' in LS 9 (Giles) 472). This type of variation in the declensional class is not uncommon amongst loan-words.

#### 2.2.2.2. PGmc *\*/sk-/* > OE [ʃ-] vs VAN */sk-/*

(e.g. PGmc *\*skipaz* > OE *scip* 'ship' vs VAN *skib* id., as attested in various Viking Age inscriptions, e.g. U 778, DR 68, and DR 335; Wessén and B. F. Jansson 1940–58: III, 357–61, and Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 104–05 and 379–82, respectively; cp. OIc *skip*)

PGmc *\*/sk-/* seems to have undergone palatalization in Old English regardless of the following vowel (see Hogg 1992: §7.17 (4)), whereas the two sounds did not undergo any significant change in Old Norse.<sup>68</sup> This is one of the dif-

<sup>68</sup> The actual character of the sounds under consideration is still a debated issue. Minkova has conducted a thorough analysis of the cluster on the basis of alliterative patterns in Old and Middle English and concludes, partially on the basis of 'mixed' <s> : <sc> alliteration in late Old English verse, that 'the cluster simplification of initial <sc> to /ʃ/ cannot be established with certainty for all the dialects until after c. 1100. The phonetic substance of the second element of the <sc> cluster could have been either a palatalized velar stop, [k'] or [kʲ] before palatal vowels,



ferences between the two languages which is most frequently commented on by scholars discussing the lexical effects of the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact (e.g. Baugh and Cable 1993: 95, Pyles and Algeo 1993: 294, and Blake 1996: 78). However, as noted already by Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 120), as far as Old English is concerned, this feature is somewhat problematic because OE <sc> represented both [ʃ] and /sk/. Thus, for instance, when suggesting the Norse etymology of OE *scegð*, it is advisable to rely on the presence of the diphthong rather than on this feature (see above, 2.2.1.1.B, and below, 2.2.2.3.C). Yet there are other terms where no other phoneme points towards their foreign character; in those cases we have to use this (in association with the spellings of the terms in Middle English as well as, whenever possible, Modern English pronunciation) as our main piece of evidence. The Norse-derived terms to which this characterization applies are the following:

(A) OE *sceppe* ‘a dry measure’ (cp. PDE *skep*; see Zupko 1968: s.v. *skep*): Given the phonological structure of the term and the fact that, as far as Old English is concerned, it is only recorded in some notes regarding food rents, charitable gifts, etc. from Scandinavianized Bury St Edmunds (see below, I.76), this term is likely to be Norse-derived (cp. OIc *skeppa* ‘a measure, bushel’ < PGmc \**skappjōn*; see Björkman 1900–02: 124, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *scēppe*, Hofmann 1955: §320, Peters 1981: 96, Kisbye 1982a: 70, and the OED 1989: s.v. *skep*, n., etc.). Its etymon is probably related to the synonymous OS *skepil* and OHG *sceffil*, which may be diminutive forms of OS *skapō* ‘vessel, container’ and OHG *skaffō* id. (see Jóhannesson 1956: s.v. (s)*qǣp*-, (s)*qǣp*-, (s)*qǣp*-, Kluge 1995: s.v. *scheffel*, and Orel 2003: \**skap(j)an*).

(B) OE *scẽr* ‘unchallenged, undisputed’ (cp. ME *skēr(e)*, PDE *skere*):<sup>69</sup> Given that we do not know how the adjective was pronounced in Old English, we cannot establish beyond certainty whether it is (1) a Norse-derived term (cp. OIc *skærr* ‘pure, clear’ < PGmc \**skairjaz*; cp. Björkman 1900–02: 125, Robertson 1939: 491, the MED: s.v. *skēre*, Hofmann 1955: §238, Peters 1981: 98, the

or some kind of voiceless velar fricative in front of back vowels and /r/. Both realizations were subsequently replaced by monosegmental [ʃ], with the change presumably starting in palatal environments’ (Minkova 2003: 201; see further Minkova 2003: 130–33). Due to the uncertainty surrounding this cluster and the fact that Minkova suggests that its phonemic assibilation would not have taken place until the late eleventh century, [ʃ] is used here instead of /ʃ/.

<sup>69</sup> This term does not seem to have been recorded by Sweet 1896, Bosworth and Toller 1898, or Clark Hall 1960. It is recorded in A. Campbell’s 1972 supplement to Toller’s 1921 work, but only as a pointer to another entry (viz. OE *sac̃l̃ās*).

*OED* 1989: s.v. *skere*, adj. and adv., and Dance 2003: 375);<sup>70</sup> or (2) the native reflex of the Proto-Germanic term (OE *\*scē̃r*). Indeed, a native derivation may also be behind ME *schēre* (PDE *sheer*). However, we cannot discount the fact that the latter Middle English term may be a new formation on the basis of the loan-word (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 125, Thors 1957: 286, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *sheer*, a. and adv.). The doubtful pronunciation of OE *scē̃r* could be supplemented by the information provided by its attestations in an argument in favour of the Norse derivation of the term, because it is always recorded in coordination with the seemingly Norse-derived OE *saclēas* (see below, 2.4.2.Q and 3.4.2.2.C.1). This kind of argument, however, does not carry much weight.

(C) OE *scinn* ‘skin’: The fact that the term exhibits /sk/ as well as the typically North Germanic assimilation PGmc *\*/nθ/ > /nn/* suggests that we are dealing with a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *skinn* ‘skin, fur’ < PGmc *\*skenþan* < PIE *\*skn̥to-*; cp. OHG *scindan*, MLG *schinden*, *schinnen* ‘to flay, peel’).<sup>71</sup> The Norse term may be attested in Ög. 171 (c. 500; Brate 1911–18: 160–62) as the determinant of the compound **ski[n]þaleubaz** ‘Skinþa-Leubaz’ (cp. OIc *\*Skinn-Ljúfr* ‘hide-lover’). However, Antonsen (Antonsen 2002: 201 and 219–20) would rather analyse the determinant as *\*skipa-* (< PIE *\*skito-*, cp. OHG *scidōn* ‘to separate’; cp. the ablaut by-form PIE *\*skoito-* > OE *scēadan* ‘to separate’, OHG *sceidan* id., Go. *skaidan* id.), and would translate the compound as ‘one who upholds justice, is peace-loving, law-abiding’. The loan-word seems to have become integrated fairly soon into Old English, as suggested by the fact that, besides as a simplex, it is recorded as part of the compounds OE *grāscinnen* ‘made of grey skins or gray fur’ and *hearmascinnen* ‘made of ermine’. Given that OE *grāscinnen* is made up of two loan-words and can be associated with OIc *gráskinn* ‘grey fur’, it is likely to have been borrowed as a whole, although we should notice that the ready-made compound seems to have undergone a process of adjectivization. OE *hearmascinnen*, however, could be interpreted as an English new formation.

(D) OE *scoru* ‘the number of twenty’ (PDE *score*; see Zupko 1968: s.v. *score*): If we assume that the term was pronounced with /sk/ in Old English, we should interpret it as a Norse-derived term (cp. OIc *skor* ‘notch, incision, the number of four hundred’, which suggests that there was a misunderstanding

<sup>70</sup> On the early monophthongization in North Germanic of *\*/ai/* when it stands in front of /x/ or /r/, see Noreen 1923: §54.

<sup>71</sup> Ralph dates PGmc *\*/nθ/ > /nn/* to ‘rather late Proto-Nordic times (albeit before the completion of syncope)’ (Ralph 2002: 714). See Schlutter 1916 for an attempt to establish a native derivation for OE *scinn*, and Björkman 1917: 314–17 for an answer to his argument.

regarding the number referred to, < PGmc *\*skurō*; cp. MLG *schore* ‘fissure’). The fact that the noun is only recorded in the same text from Bury St Edmunds which includes OE *sceppe* (viz. Rec 5.4 (Rob 104); see below, I.79) also points towards its foreign origin (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 129, Hofmann 1955: §319, Peters 1981: 96, Kisbye 1982a: 80, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*skurō(n)*).

### 2.2.2.3. PGmc *\*[ð]* > OE /d/ vs OIc *[ð]* (/θ/)

(e.g. PGmc *\*wurðunþ* > OE *wurdon* ‘became [pl.]’ vs VAN *urþu* ‘[they] became’ in Vg. 184, Jungner and Svärström 1940–71: 330–31, cp. OIc *urðu*)

*\*[ð]*, whether originating from PIE *\*/d<sup>h</sup>/* or as a result of PGmc *\*/θ/* (< PIE *\*/t/*) having been affected by Verner’s Law, is always occluded in West Germanic (Hogg 1992: §§4.17–18), whereas in North Germanic it tends to remain as a fricative unless it appears in initial position, after a nasal or liquid consonant, or is geminated (see Noreen 1913: §61, and Noreen 1923: §223). The presence of <ð> where we would expect <d> is therefore a feature that we can rely on to identify Norse-derived terms. However, this feature has to be treated with two caveats in mind. On the one hand, as pointed out by Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 161), Old English may exhibit both [d] and [ð] as native variants of the effects of Verner’s Law; thus, the presence of [ð] instead of [d] can be considered to be a clearer indication of Norse derivation when the dental derives from PIE *\*/d<sup>h</sup>/*. On the other hand, we should bear in mind that Old English texts show some examples of fricativization (i.e. [d] > [ð]), although this process is mainly associated with the Middle English period (see Welna 2004, and below, III.1.8.C).

There are a few terms for which Norse origin can be claimed on the basis of the presence of [ð] instead of [d]:<sup>72</sup>

(A) OE *barð* / *barða*: As discussed above, 2.2.1.8.A, the evidence in favour of its Norse derivation provided by lack of breaking is supplemented by the presence of the fricative instead of the occlusive. Interestingly, the term is also recorded with the occlusive; this attestation could be interpreted as a scribal error (see above, note 52 in this chapter), or it could be associated with the common tendency of Old English speakers to adapt the Norse-derived terms to their own pronunciation (cp. OE *hofding* and the by-name *rōda* ‘the red’, cp. OIc *rauðr* ‘red’; see above, 2.2.1.2.D, Björkman 1900–02: 161, and Luick 1901: 414).

<sup>72</sup> On the presence of <ð> in OE *grið*, *nīðing*, and ‘serð’ as a sign of Norse derivation, see below, 2.5.I, 2.5.O, and 2.4.2.R, respectively.

(B) OE *lið* ‘fleet, troop’: The etymology of this term is slightly problematic because it seems to represent an ablaut variant of PIE *\*leit-* > PGmc *\*leiþanan* > OE *liðan* ‘to go, travel’ and OIc *liða* id.<sup>73</sup> That Verner’s Law affected the terms associated with this root is suggested by OE *lid* ‘ship’ (cp. OIc *lið* id.) and *lida* ‘sailor’ (cp. OIc *liði* ‘follower’), but the possibility that by-forms without its effects could have existed as well cannot be fully discounted. Thus, even though the presence of the dental fricative may be suggestive of a Norse origin, the evidence is not conclusive. Yet the general acceptance of its foreign origin (see Simek 1982: 135) finds support in the facts that (1) the term is well attested in Scandinavian texts (e.g. in the phrase **i liþi** in Sö. 160, Sö. 217, Sö. 254, and Sö. 338, where the gen. sing. **lis** is attested as well; Brate and Wessén 1924–36: 122, 192–94, 221–22, and 323–30; cp. OIc *lið* ‘troops, host, company of ships, aid’);<sup>74</sup> and (2) as far as Old English texts are concerned, it is only recorded in texts from the late Old English period (see below, I.55.1).

A compound which has this term as the determinant, viz. OE *liðsmann* ‘seafarer, pirate’ (cp. OIc *liðsmaðr* ‘follower, warrior’; cp. the Viking Age Norse personal name **liþsmoþr** in U 1160; Wessén and B. F. Jansson 1940–58: IV, 605–10; cp. Jesch 2001b: 198–99), is recorded slightly earlier than the simplex (see below, I.55.2). There is only one context where the term retains the dental fricative (viz. ChronE (Irvine) 1036.5); it is more frequently attested as <litism> (e.g. ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1050.9 and ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.34), which is reminiscent of the process of dissimilation /θs/ > /ts/ attested in late West Saxon, as well as the more common process /sθ/ > /st/ (A. Campbell 1959: §481; cp. below, 2.4.1.D).<sup>75</sup> The loan-word is also attested as the determinatum of the compound OE *sciplið* ‘naval force’ (cp. VAN **-kib-liþ**, which can be reconstructed as *\*skiplið*, in U 348; Wessén and B. F. Jansson 1940–58: II, 90–94).<sup>76</sup> Given the existence of equivalent terms in Viking Age

<sup>73</sup> It has occasionally been suggested that the meaning ‘to travel by sea’ for OIc *liða* is a semantic loan from OE *liðan*; however, Jesch points out that this is ‘probably a chimera’ (Jesch 2001b: 175; cp. Hofmann 1955: §94). Lund (Lund 1993: 119) argues that, given the derivation of these terms from PIE *\*lei-*, which he translates as ‘to pour’, ‘to move over water’ would have been their primary meaning, while ‘to go, travel’ would be a secondary meaning derived by generalization. Pokorny (Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *leit(h)-*), however, translates the Proto-Indo-European root of the verb as ‘to leave, die, go’ (cp. Rix and others 2001: 410, s.v. 1. *\*leit-*).

<sup>74</sup> On the meaning of OIc *lið*, see further Jesch 2001b: 187–94 and 198–201.

<sup>75</sup> In native Old English terms the general tendency is for /θ/ to become assimilated to /s/: /θs/ > /ss/ (see A. Campbell 1959: 481, and Hogg 1992: §7.4).

<sup>76</sup> On *skiplið* in U 348, see Jesch 2001b: 190. Thier (Thier 2002: 37) would also like to see

Norse, it is not clear whether these compounds represent English new formations or loan-blends. In any case, the Anglo-Saxons' familiarity with OE *liðan* and other related terms may have facilitated the fast incorporation of the terms into the Old English lexicon (cp. OE *scipliðend* 'seaman, voyager', and *scipliðende* 'sailing').

The etymology of the compound OE *sumorlida* '(Viking) summer fleet / army' is a contested matter. Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 161) and, relying on him, Carr (Carr 1939: 31), suggest that the compound represents a loan-blend (cp. VAN *Sumarliði*, attested as a personal name in Danish coin inscriptions from 1065 x 1075, DR M74, M75, and M76; Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 570–71) and that <d> represents the influence of OE *lid* and *lida*. Similarly, Peters (Peters 1981: 117–18) suggests that the Viking Age etymon was misunderstood and the determinatum was identified with OE *lida*. Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §223) is much less certain about the foreign nature of the determinatum because the compound is already attested in ChronA (Bately) 871, and <d> suggests instead a native derivation; furthermore, there does not seem to be any attested semantic parallel for the determinatum in Scandinavian texts (cp. OIc *liði*), where it is not used as a collective noun. Other compounds with OE *sumor* 'summer' as the determinant are widely attested in Old English. Therefore, we do not need to assume that the compound was borrowed ready-made; it could be a native new formation instead. The main problem lies in explaining the seemingly strange meaning for OE *lida*, which is not otherwise recorded as a collective noun either. It may be the case that the term represented by OE *lida* finds its parallel not in OIc *liði* but in OIc *lið*; according to this hypothesis, the final vowel suggests that the term has been borrowed from an oblique form or, more likely, from a plural form. We should remember that, given the nature of the *lið* during the Viking Age, it is likely that the groups of Scandinavian marauders were composed of several *lið* (VAN \**liðu*?; cp. VAN \**lagu*; Noreen 1923: §356 Anm. 6).<sup>77</sup> The formal adaptation of the term can be compared with the way in which Scandinavian personal names are rendered in the ninth-century entries of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Bibire notes that 'ninth-century name-forms such as *Hingwar* or *Godrum* or *Hæsten*, as written

a loan-word in OE 'yðlið' (And 445); however, the facts that the same compound is spelt with <d> in And 278 and that OE *lið* meaning 'ship' does not seem to have been common at all during the Viking Age (see Jesch 2001b: 189) suggest that <ð> should probably be interpreted as a mistake (cp. Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *yð-lid*, and Krapp 1932; cp. OE *ýðlida* 'a wave-traverser, ship' in Beo 198).

<sup>77</sup> On the nature of the *lið* during the Viking Age, see Lund 1986 and Lund 1993: 119–20.

in the Parker manuscript (CCCC 173), show little understanding of Norse names, and no serious attempt to reproduce them phonetically' (Bibire 2001: 98; cp. Lehiste 1958).

(C) OE *scegð*: As in the case of OE *barð* and *barða*, the suggestion of the Norse origin of this term does not rely only on the presence of the dental consonant. Its diphthong is also indicative of Norse derivation (see above, 2.2.1.1.B; see also above, 2.2.2.2); in fact, the diphthong could be analysed as the main factor in favour of the Norse derivation of the term because of the aforementioned problems associated with the presence of the dental fricative and the fact that PGmc *\*skaip-* seems to have reflexes in Old English with both /d/ (e.g. *scēadan* 'to divide') and /θ/ (e.g. *scēað* 'sheath').

(D) OE *wæð*: OE *wæð* 'ford, water, sea, ocean' is a cognate of OIc *vað* 'ford, wading place' and OHG *wat* 'ford'. On one occasion in the *OEC* the term is recorded instead as <wæð> (ChronD (Cubbin) 1073.4), where the presence of /θ/ instead of /d/ may be taken as indicative of Norse influence (see Holthausen 1934: s.v. *wæð*, and Peters 1981: 98; cp. Björkman 1900–02: 167, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *vað*). The northern provenance of the annal (see below, II.163.17) suggests that the term should be associated with ME *wath* and PDE *wath* 'ford' (see the *MED*: s.v. *wath*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *wath*), which is mainly associated with heavily Scandinavianized areas (see below, 4.2.1).

#### 2.2.2.4. *R*-metathesis

(e.g. PGmc *\*raznan* > OE *ærn* 'house' vs OIc *rann* id.)

Hogg (Hogg 1992: §7.94) explains that *r*-metathesis in Old English normally takes place when /r/ is followed by a short vowel and a dental or alveolar consonant, usually /n/ or /s/. *R*-metathesis in Old Norse is much more limited and it seems to be characteristic of unstressed contexts (see Noreen 1904: §§337.12 and 339.2, and Noreen 1923: §315). Thus, Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 181–82) includes this feature amongst the formal indications of Norse origin. However, as he points out himself, it is not a definite indication of the foreign origin of a term because there may have been cases with different by-forms, and metathesis does not affect all contexts equally (e.g. Hogg 1992: §7.94 explains that metathesis when /r/ is followed by /d/ is restricted to Northumbrian; see also A. H. Smith 1970: s.v. *ærn/renn*).

As far as Old English texts are concerned, there are three terms where metathesis may be taken as an indication of Norse origin:

(A) OE *brynige* 'coat of mail' (cp. OIc *brynja* id. < PGmc *\*brunjōn*; cf. OE *byrne* id.): The facts that the term has the ending *-ige* instead of the expected gemination and disappearance of PGmc *\*/j/* after a long syllable and that its



attestations in Old English are in the main associated with late texts from Scandinavianized East Anglia (see below, 3.3.4, 3.3.6, and IV.2.1.A) also support Björkman's inclusion of this term in the list of words 'decidedly or probably due to Scand. influence' (Björkman 1900–02: 183–84; cp. Peters 1981: 95, Kisbye 1982a: 50, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *brinie*, *bryn timer*, Kniezsa 1994: 241, and Dance 2003: 344).<sup>78</sup> The term is also recorded as the determinatum in the new formation OE *healsbryn timer* 'corselet'.

(B) OE *rennan* 'to ride': The fact that Old English texts only record metathetic reflexes of the weak causative Proto-Germanic verb *\*rannjanan*, viz. OE *earnan* / *arnan* 'to run, ride, gallop' (cf. OHG *girennan* 'to coagulate', ON *renna* 'to make / let run'), can be taken as an indication that OE *rennan* is Norse-derived (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 185, Jordan 1974: §165, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *run*, v., and Kniezsa 1994: 241). The non-metathetic forms are only attested in the Interpolations to the *Peterborough Chronicle*, which exhibit Old Norse influence, and this dialectal distribution can be taken as further support for the argument of Norse derivation (see below, I.69 and II.163.18).<sup>79</sup> However, it may also be the case that non-metathetic forms have been influenced by *r*-initial forms of the strong verb OE *rinnan* 'to run' (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *rennen*, v.1). Yet, admittedly, the latter are not very common in Old English texts either, metathetic OE *yrnan* being more frequent. Mezger rejects the possibility that the forms under analysis are reflexes of OE *rinnan* on the basis that 'the Germanic phenomenon of the transition of *ē* to *ī* is sometimes repeated in ME (*hinten* to seize, *wind(en)* to go, *inde* the end, etc.)' (Mezger 1933: 1037), but this can be counteracted by the fact that the opposite change also takes place in closed syllables in contact with a nasal (cp. ME *clemben* 'to climb', and *fenger* 'finger'; see Jordan 1974: §36).

(C) OE *ðorp* 'hamlet; small, subsidiary settlement': As in the case of OE *rennan*, lack of metathesis may suggest that this term represents, not OE *ðrop* 'hamlet; small, subsidiary settlement', but its Norse cognate (cp. OIc *þorp* 'isolated farm' < PGmc *\*þurpan*; see A. H. Smith 1970: s.v. *þorp* §1, and Kniezsa

<sup>78</sup> The *DOE* also records the use of the term in the so-called Vespasian Homilies (*DOE*: s.v. *bryn timer*); these texts, however, are not included in the *OEC*, which is in keeping with the fact that they are commonly analysed as belonging to the Middle English period (see the *MED* and Laing 1993: 82–83).

<sup>79</sup> During the Middle English period the term seems to have gained some wider use, though, particularly from late Middle English onwards, its early Middle English attestations being still associated in the main with the Scandinavianized areas (see the *MED*: s.v. *rennen*, v.1).

1994: 241).<sup>80</sup> The dialectal distribution of the term (see below, 3.3.6 and note 28 in Chapter 3) also supports this interpretation.<sup>81</sup>

The term is attested as a common noun only once the *OEC* (see below, I.90); it is, however, commonly attested in charters associated with the Danelaw as a place-name formative (e.g. Rec 24.1 (Rob 84) 5 and 9, Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) 8 and 31, etc.).

**2.2.2.5. PGmc \*/w/ + \*/o, o:, u, u:, r [+ o, o:, u, u:], l/ > OE /w + o, o:, u, u:, r [+ o, o:, u, u:], l/ vs OIc /o, o:, u, u:, r [+ o, o:, u, u:], l/** (e.g. PGmc *\*ulitiz* > OE *ulite* ‘brightness, appearance’ vs OIc *litr* ‘colour, hue’)

As far as Old Norse is concerned, Noreen (Noreen 1904: §252, Noreen 1913: §85.2, and Noreen 1923: §235) explains that, in initial position before the aforementioned sounds, the back glide was lost already in the eighth century (cp. Ralph 2002: 716). Since this is not a tendency followed by Old English, the lack of the glide in a word where it would be expected in Old English seems to be suggestive of Norse derivation. Only one word can be clearly discussed in association with this sound change.

OE *rōt* ‘root’ is first attested in late Old English, mainly in manuscripts from the twelfth century (see below, I.70 and IV.2.1.L). The term is commonly derived from the Norse etymon represented by OIc *rót*, which should be associated with L *rādx* ‘root’ (> OE *redic* ‘radish’) and Gr. *ῥάδιξ* ‘branch’. These terms are thought to be reflexes of PIE *\*ureH<sub>2</sub>d-*, in accordance with the facts that PIE */\*eH<sub>2</sub>C/* (where *C* represents any consonant) appears as */a:C/* in non-Anatolian Indo-European languages (see de Vaan 2008: s.v. *rādx*, *-īcis*, Bjorvand and Lindeman 2007: s.v. *rot*, and Forston 2004: §§3.18–20) and that the glide tends to get lost in initial position when followed by the liquid in both Latin and Greek (see Rix 1976: §71, and Leumann 1977: §§140 and 195). While the Latin and the Greek terms are thus associated with the full grade of the root, the *i*-stem nouns Go. *waurts*, OE *wyrt*, OHG *wurz*, and OS *wurt* are considered to derive from the reduced grade, viz. PIE *\*urd-* > PGmc *\*wurt-*

<sup>80</sup> Smith (A. H. Smith 1970: s.v. *þorp* §§3 and 8) explains that the Norse term is likely to have been brought over to England by speakers of Old East Norse rather than Old West Norse because it does not seem to have been widely used in Norway or Iceland during the Viking Age, while it was fairly common both in Denmark and Sweden. This suggestion has, however, been recently contested; see Cullen and others 2011: ch. 7. I am very thankful to the authors for allowing me to see a copy of their work before its publication.

<sup>81</sup> See, however, Cullen and others 2011: ch. 2 on the problems associated with establishing the etymology of particular uses of OE *ðrop* and *ðorp* in English place-names.



(see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *u(e)rād*, *uerād*-, *urād*-, Jóhannesson 1956: s.v. *u(e)rād*, *uerād*-, Lehmann 1986: s.v. *waurts*, Bjorvand and Lindeman 2007: s.v. *urt*, and Orel 2003: s.vv. *\*wurtiz* and *\*wrōtiz*). Accordingly, OIc *rót* seems to be the only Germanic reflex of the full-grade root.<sup>82</sup> Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 252, 197 n. 2; cp. Björkman 1901: 23 n. 2) does not discuss OE *rōt* amongst the words whose phonological form is indicative of their Norse origin, though, because, in his opinion, the initial presence of the glide in OIc *rót* ‘root’ is not beyond doubt. In fact, Hough (Hough 1996) has recently argued in favour of analysing this term as a native word on the basis that it is likely to be the first component in the place-names *Ratley* (Warwickshire, first attested in 1086 as *Rotelei*) and *Roothill* (Surrey, first attested as *Atterotehelde* in 1291; cp. Mann 1984–87: s.v. *urād*-.). Yet, given that this interpretation cannot be verified and that the aforementioned roots seem to be the best way to account for the cognate terms recorded throughout the Indo-European languages, it seems better to agree with many other scholars about the Norse-derived character of the Old English term (see Serjeantson 1935: 69–70, de Vries 1961: s.v. *rót*, Peters 1981: 97, and Bjorvand and Lindeman 2007: s.v. *rot*; cp. Dance 2003: 160).

The adjective OE *rōtfaest* ‘rootfast’ may be an independent English new formation (cp. OE *sōðfaest* ‘true, trustworthy’, *ðrymfaest* ‘glorious, illustrious’, etc.) or a Norse-derived loan-blend (cp. OIc *rótfastr* ‘rooted, fixed’; see Carr 1939: 31). The fact that it is first attested in texts from the Scandinavianized areas (see below, 3.3.6, and the *MED*: s.v. *rōte*, n.4, sense 9) could be taken as evidence of the latter.

#### 2.2.2.6. Loss of nasal in unstressed position

(e.g. PGmc *\*in* > OE *in* ‘in’ vs OIc *i* ‘in’)

Loss of nasal in unstressed syllables is already present in early Old Northumbrian texts, but it is otherwise uncommon in Old English except for the Mercian glosses to the Rushworth Gospels (viz. Rushworth 1; see below, II.168; see Hogg 1992: §§ 7.98–100; but see also below). Thus, lack of /m/ in ‘fra’ or ‘fro’ in various Old English texts could be seen as indicative of Norse-derivation (cp. VAN **fra** ‘from’ in Ög. 136, Brate 1911–18: 130; cp. OIc *frá*, on which see Noreen 1923: §§298.1 and 299.5; cf. OE *from* / *fram*; see Björkman 1900–02: 100–01, de Vries 1961: s.v. *frá*, C. Clark 1970: lxiii, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *fro*, Kniezsa

<sup>82</sup> The etymology of the East Scandinavian forms with /o/ instead of /o:/ remains problematic (see de Vries 1961: s.v. *rót*), although Falk and Torp associate MnDa. *rod* and MnSwed. *rot* with the same etymological explanation as OIc *rót* (Falk and Torp 1910–11: s.v. *rod*).

1994: 241–43, Dance 2003: 353, and Krygier 2009).<sup>83</sup> Norse-derivation might be most clearly suggested in those cases where lack of /m/ is supported by the dialectal distribution: viz. the cases of ‘fro’ in the Bury St Edmunds documents Ch 1083 (Harm 23) and Ch 1527 (Whitelock 24), and the cases of ‘fra’ in the heavily Norse-influenced Interpolations and Continuations of the E-text of the *Chronicle* either as a simplex or as part of the complex adverb *faward* (cf. OE *framweardes* ‘away from’; see below, I.32 and IV.2.1.F). Notably, the nasal is not missing in forms of the preposition recorded in pre-1121 E-annals which are not interpolations; however, the presence of <o> for <on> in ChronE (Irvine) 1137.40, if it is not a scribal mistake, suggests that the loss of the nasal in prepositions and other unstressed forms might not have been a fully alien process in this part of the country in early Middle English (and possibly late Old English; cp. Irvine 2004: cxxxviii). As pointed out by Krygier (Krygier 2009), the presence of <o> for <a> could be explained as a result of contamination with the Old English preposition.

The attestation of /m/-less forms in texts from outside the Scandinavianized areas (other than Rushworth 1) is more problematic, because prepositions are generally considered to feature fairly low in scales of borrowability (see Lass 1997: 190 and below, 3.2.1). The *DOE* (s.v. *fram*, prep. and adv.) explains that the Old English preposition is commonly abbreviated to <fra’> / <fro’> in glosses and glossaries; thus, this could account for the lack of nasal in various forms from the Vespasian Psalter gloss (written in ninth-century Mercian; see A. Campbell 1967: 81–83, and Ker 1990: 203; PsGLA (Kuhn) 37.3, 38.10, 39.12, 50.10, 100.4, and 106.38), the *Benedictine Rule* (BenRGL 38.69.7; see below, II.8), the Winchcombe Psalter gloss (written in early eleventh-century West Saxon; PsGLC (Wildhagen) 103.7), the Bosworth Psalter gloss (written in the early eleventh century, possibly in Kent; see Ker 1990: no. 129; PsGLA (Lindelöf) 19(2).38), the Stowe Psalter (written in mid-eleventh-century West Saxon; see Kimmens 1979: xviii–xix and xxvii–xxx, and Ker 1990: no. 271; PsGLF (Kimmens) 65.20), the Arundel Psalter gloss (written in the West Saxon dialect in the second half of the eleventh century; see Oess 1910: 15–17, and Ker 1990: no. 134; PsCaJ (Oess) 6(5).5, PsGLJ (Oess) 63.2 and 118.134), and the Salisbury Psalter gloss (written c. 1100 in the West Saxon dialect; see Sisam and Sisam 1959: §§29, 44, where they explain that the scribe of the gloss was ‘erratic in his spelling’, frequently dropping or adding letters, and 58–75, and Ker 1990: no. 37; PsGLK (Sisam) 18.7, 21.12, and 30.12). The same explana-

<sup>83</sup> I am very thankful to Prof. Marcin Krygier for having provided me with a printed copy of his paper.

tion or an explanation relying on the fact that nasal consonants can occasionally be lost in late unstressed contexts (see above) could be given for the nasal-less forms in the following eleventh-century texts: the anonymous translation of Genesis (see below, II.5), a rubric in the order for visiting and anointing the sick in the missal of Robert of Jumièges (see below, II.225), and Ch 255 (Birch 1131–33) (see below, II.24). However, since it may also be the case that these forms represent the Norse-derived reflex of the preposition, they cannot be fully excluded from our discussion; accordingly, they are recorded in Chapter 3 and Appendix I. If these attestations do represent Norse derivation, they would point towards a very early spread of the preposition in the non-Scandinavianized areas; the similarity between the Old English and Old Norse prepositions could be put forward as an explanation for what otherwise might be a very unusual fact.

### 2.3. Morphological Evidence

The morphological structure of a small number of terms points towards their Norse derivation. In some cases Norse origin is claimed on the basis of the presence of inflectional or derivational morphemes which are characteristic of Old Norse rather than Old English.<sup>84</sup> In other cases the morphological evidence for Norse derivation is less compelling.

#### 2.3.1. Presence of Old Norse Inflectional or Derivational Morphemes

##### 2.3.1.1. Clearer cases

(A) OE *gestning* ‘lodgings’: Napier (Napier 1905–06: 296), Picard (Picard 1980: 721), and Treharne (Treharne 1997: 73 and 170 n. to l. 417) suggest that this noun, which is recorded in the *Life of St Giles*, should be analysed as Norse-derived (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *gesteninge*, and Dance 2003: 355; see also the *DOE*: s.v. *gystning*). Even though they do not give any reason in favour of their

<sup>84</sup> Declensional endings are also retained in place-names (see Stenton 1971: 522, and Stafford 1985: 120). ‘[L]isingar’ (cp. OE *lysing* ‘freedman’; see below, 2.4.1.F) in Ch 1529 (Whitelock 36) 3 could be said to retain the Norse acc. pl. ending *-ar* instead of the Old English equivalent *-as* (< PGmc \*ōz; cp. *kunu(n)kar* ‘kings’, nom. pl., in Ög. 136, Bugge 1910b, and Brate 1911–18: 130, cp. OIc *konungar*; see Noreen 1913: §191.5); however, Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 206) explains that the manuscript where the will is recorded has other cases of <r> for <s>.

argument, we could assume that it relies on the presence of <e> instead of the expected <ie> or <y> (cp. OE <gesthus>; see below, III.1.11.B), the possible velar nature of the initial consonant (cp. OIc *gestr* vs OE *gyst* ‘guest, stranger’ < PGmc \**zastiz*; cp. above, 2.2.2.1), and the fact that the term seems to record the derivational morpheme *-ning*. The phonological evidence, however, cannot be taken as clearly suggestive of Norse derivation. We cannot know whether the pronunciation of the initial consonant was velar rather than palatal,<sup>85</sup> and the presence of <e> for the expected <ie> or <y> can be easily explained as a Kentish feature of the manuscript recording the text (see above, 2.2.2.1.C). Two explanations can be offered for this vowel:

(A.1) /e/ represents the *i*-umlauted reflex of OE /æ/ (cp. PGmc \**zastiz*), which has not undergone palatal diphthongization;<sup>86</sup>

(A.2) /e/ may be a result of the general tendency in Kentish for front vowels to merge with /e, e:/ (see Hogg 1992: §§5.188–96). Indeed, the text records other cases of <e> for the expected <y> (see also Treharne 1997: 67): e.g. <get> in LS 9 (Giles) 466 and 470 (cf. WS *gyt* ‘yet, still, besides’, which is also likely to exhibit the effects of palatal diphthongization, according to Hogg 1992: §5.53 n. 3) and several forms of OE *hēran* instead of OE *hȳran* ‘to hear’ (e.g. LS 9 (Giles) 14, 41, etc.; cp. Ahern 1975: 26, and Treharne 1997: 67).

Morphology seems to offer more reliable evidence. While the deverbal nominal suffix *-ing* is common in the various Germanic languages (see Lass 1994: 201–02), the secondary suffix *-ning*, which also forms deverbal nouns, is rather characteristic of Old Norse, mainly its Eastern branch (see Loman 1961: 134–38, 288, and 295–96, and Wessén 1965: 65–67). Thus, the term should be associated with ODa. *gestning* ‘lodging’ and OSwed. *gästning* id. (cp. OIc *gisting* ‘night-lodging, accommodation for the night’; see Loman 1961: 173, 180–82, 184, and 186).

Dance (Dance 2003: 355) suggests that ME *gest(e)ninge* ‘feast, banquet; lodging and/or food’ may be a new formation on the basis of ME *gest(e)nen* ‘to have or take lodging, stay’, which in its turn is likely to have been formed on ME *gest* ‘guest’ (cp. OIc *gestr* ‘guest’). It seems strange that the Middle English verb was formed with a suffix *-nen*, as opposed to the more common *-en*, although the verb could, admittedly, have developed as part of an increasing trend to

<sup>85</sup> Interestingly, though, there are no traces in Middle English texts of a palatalized pronunciation for the initial consonant of ME *gest* and the other members of its word-field (see MED: s.vv. *gest*, *gesten*, *gestenen*, *gesteninge*, *gestinge*; see also Dance 2003: 79, and Dance 2011: 98).

<sup>86</sup> On the dialectal distribution of palatal diphthongization and its inconsistency, see Hogg 1992: §§5.50–52.

create verbs with the derivational affixes *-n-* and *-l-*, a trend which might have increased as a result of the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact (cp. D. G. Miller 2004: 11–12, and D. G. Miller 2010: II, 108–19). The *MED* (s.v. *ges-tenen*) suggests that the verb may be Norse-derived, but the Scandinavian languages do not record a related verb with the nasal in its root (cp. OSwed. *gästa* ‘to be a guest at someone’s house, visit’ and OIc *gista* ‘to pass the night’; see Dance 2003: 173). Therefore, the verb could instead be presented as a back-formation on the basis of the Norse-derived Old English deverbal noun, with *-n-* not having been recognized as part of the derivational suffix because that by-form did not exist in English, while Old English did have some verbs with *-n-*.

(B) OE *ðīr* ‘female slave, bondswoman’: cp. OIc *þír* ‘slave’ (< PGmc *\*þewīz*, according to de Vries 1961: s.v. *þír*; see also Hofmann 1955: §236, Kisbye 1982b: 59, and Peters 1981: 93). The suggested Norse etymon is only recorded as a feminine noun in the poem *Rígsþula*, where it is the name of the slave woman who marries Þræll (see Dronke 1997: 164, stanzas 10 and 11). Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §§236 and 399) explains that /r/ in the Norse term initially represented the nominative singular ending but was incorporated into the stem, according to which it was no longer understood as a declensional ending (cp. OIc *þírr* ‘slave’; see de Vries 1961: s.v. *þírr*). If the term were native, we would have expected the ending of the nominative singular to drop (see A. Campbell 1959: §404, and Hogg 1992: §4.10). The fact that the term is only attested in the Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels, a Northumbrian text which records a significant number of technical and non-technical Norse-derived terms, and, not surprisingly, Owun’s glosses to the Rushworth Gospels (on their relationship, see below, 4.2.3 and II.168) also contributes to the association of the term with the Scandinavian newcomers and their linguistic practices.

(C) OE *ðrǣl(l)* ‘thrall, slave’: This term is commonly associated with OIc *þræll* ‘slave’, the etymology of which is unclear. Two Proto-Germanic forms, viz. *\*þraxilaz* and *\*þranxilaz*, have been suggested as the likeliest etyma (see de Vries 1961: s.v. *þræll*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*þraxilaz*). From a phonological point of view, OE *ðrǣl* could be interpreted as an Anglian derivation of the former where the diphthong developed from breaking has not undergone *i*-umlaut, but has undergone smoothing (cp. Angl. *hlehan* vs WS *hlyhhan*; see Hogg 1992: §5.82). Thus, we could hypothesize the following evolution: *\*þra-hil-* > *\*þræhil-* > *\*þræuhil-* > *\*þræahil-* > *\*þræhil-* > *\*þræil-* > *þrǣl*.<sup>87</sup> Given the consistency with which lengthening of the previous vowel after the loss of /x/

<sup>87</sup> On the possibility of /x/ causing smoothing even when followed by /i/, see Hogg 1992: §5.93.

takes place (see Hogg 1992: §§5.124–25), this derivation would require an ad hoc explanation to account for the Middle English form *thrall*, which implies a short Old English vowel, i.e. OE *ðræll* (cf. ME *thrēl* < OE *ðræ̃l*). OE *ðræ̃l* could not be a native derivation from PGmc *\*þranxilaz* because we would expect to find the reflex (*i*-umlauted or non-umlauted) of /o:/ (< PGmc *\*/anx/*, see above, 2.2.1.5).

In this case the morphology of the word seems to present the strongest evidence in favour of its Norse-derived character. As explained by Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 19 and 167), the attestation of forms with <ll> in Old English hints at the fact that we are dealing with a Norse-derived loan-word because the second /l/ can be analysed as a relic of the nominative singular ending *-r* (< PGmc *\*-z*), which has undergone a process of assimilation in Old Norse (see Noreen 1913: §77, and Noreen 1923: §277).<sup>88</sup> The forms with only one liquid, which are more common in Old English texts, lack any sign of the ending, and this could be taken as an indication that they derive from the other cases. However, given that the presence of a geminate consonant after a long vowel was not common in Old English (see Hogg 1992: §5.199), this could have led to the development of various by-forms during the process of integration of the term: (1) the initially long vowel followed by two consonants would have been shortened (OE *ðræll*); and (2) the geminated consonant would have been simplified (OE *ðræ̃l*). The term seems to have been fairly well integrated into the Old English lexicon, as suggested by its participation in word-formation processes (e.g. OE *ðræ̃lriht* ‘serf’s right’).

### 2.3.1.2. Possible cases

(A) OE *fēstermann* ‘bondsmen, sureties’: The Norse-derived character of the term may be suggested, not only by the dialectal distribution of its attestations in Old English texts (see below, 3.4.2.2.C.2), but also by its morphological structure, although things are not as clear as with the nouns discussed under 2.3.1.1. While its meaning associates it with OIc *festumaðr* ‘bail, surety’, its form could be explained by identifying OE *fēster* / *fōster* ‘sustenance, maintenance’ as the determinant of the compound, in which case there would be nothing in its phonological or morphological structure suggesting Norse origin. Alternatively, as suggested by Holthausen (Holthausen 1934: s.v. *fester-menn*; cp. Hofmann 1955: §213, and Peters 1981: 93), it could be explained as an

<sup>88</sup> *ll*-forms are restricted to the Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels (e.g. <ðræl-lum> in MkG1 (Li) 13.34).



adaptation of OWN *festarmaðr* ‘betrothed man’ (OSwed. *fēsta-* or *fēstimaper*, ODa. *festeman*, *feste(r)man*). *Festar* is the genitive singular of *festr*, which is normally used in Old West Norse in the plural with the meaning ‘engagement’. In Old Swedish *festr* had the corresponding term *fēst* ‘bail, surety’. This meaning in Old West Norse was expressed with the weak feminine noun *fēsta*. OWN *fēsta* and OEN *fēst* are likely to be represented by OE *feste* ‘pledge, security’ (Hofmann 1955: §214; see below, 2.4.2.J). Hofmann suggests that it may have been the case that the attested meaning for OWN *festarmaðr* developed later or that the semantic difference between ‘surety’ and ‘betrothed man’ was not pan-Scandinavian (Hofmann 1955: §213).

(B) OE *manslot* ‘share in ownership of land, measure of land’: The presence of <s> instead of the expected <es> could be taken as an indication that the term has retained the Norse inflectional ending for the genitive singular masculine (cp. OIc *mannsblutr* ‘person’s share’) because other masculine and neuter terms in the genitive singular in the same text recording the compound (instead of *manna blot*) retain the ending <es> (e.g. <mealtes> in Rec 5.4 (Rob 104) 2, <ures drihtnes hælendes cristes> in Rec 5.4 (Rob 104) 17; cp. Napier 1905–06: 308). However, it could also be the case that <e> has dropped because of syncope. The dialectal distribution of the term may therefore offer stronger evidence in favour of its Norse origin (see below, 2.4.2.O).

(C) OE *sandermann* ‘messenger’: While the two components of the compound are clearly native (cp. OE *sand* ‘embassy; message; messenger’ and *mann* ‘man’), the presence of the inflectional ending <-er> as opposed to the native genitive singular ending <-es> (cp. ME *sandesman* ‘messenger’) could be attributed to the influence of the Norse inflection (cp. OIc *-ar*; cp. the MED: s.v. *söndes-man*, the OED 1989: s.v. *sandesman*, and Kniezsa 1994: 239). However, it may also be the case that, as suggested by the MED (s.v. *sönder-bōde*) for ME *sanderbode* ‘messenger’, <r> is an intrusive consonant. The fact that the term is recorded in the Norse-influenced First Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle* (see below, I.74 and II.163.18) could be taken as further evidence in favour of its Norse origin.

### 2.3.2. Other Types of Morphological Evidence

#### 2.3.2.1. Nominal Morphology

(A) OE *band* ‘bond’: Old English texts frequently attest *bend* ‘bond, cord’ (< PGmc \**bandjō* / *bandjan*); however, OE *band*, which seems to be the reflex of the by-form \**bandan*, is not attested until the twelfth century, ChronE (Irvine) 1126 being the first and only Old English context recording it (see below, I.4). Given its late attestation and the fact that its first records are associated with East Midland texts, which record a significant number of Norse-derived terms (see further the *MED*: s.v. *bōnd*), this by-form is commonly analysed as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *band* ‘band, cord’ < PGmc \**bandan*; see Björkman 1900–02: 209, Serjeantson 1935: 77, the *MED*: s.v. *bōnd*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *band*, C. Clark 1970: lxiii, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *band*, n.<sup>1</sup>, and Dance 2003: 343). However, given the existence of reflexes of PGmc \**bandan* in other West Germanic languages (cp. OHG *bant* and OS *band*), the possibility that this is in fact a native by-form cannot be ignored (cp. OIc *bendi* and *band*, OFris. *bende* and *bande*, on which see Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.v. *bende*; cp. the *DOE*: s.v. *bend*, sense 1.a.iii, where the context from the 1126-annal is associated with OE *bend*, and Kniezsa 1994, where the term is not mentioned). It could of course also be the case that this by-form developed by association of the term with OE *band*, preterite singular of OE *bindan* ‘to bind’.

(B) OE (*on*) *lofte* ‘in the air, aloft’: OE *loft* is generally accepted to be a Norse-derived loan-word based on the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *loft* / *lopt* ‘air, atmosphere, sky; loft, upper room’ (see Björkman 1900–02: 249–50, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *loft*, Serjeantson 1935: 70, the *MED*: s.v. *loft*, Hofmann 1955: §286, de Vries 1961: s.v. *loft*, Peters 1981: 97, Hug 1987: 351–52, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *loft*, n., and Dance 2003: 367, referring to ME *lōfsōng* ‘song of praise’). The reason for this attribution is that the Norse term is the only *a*-stem noun amongst the Germanic cognates (cp. PGmc \**luft-*), according to which \*/u/ was lowered to /o/ following *a*-umlaut (see Noreen 1913: §31.a, and Noreen 1923: §61). The native cognate OE *lyft* ‘air, sky, clouds’, which, as Clark Hall (Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *lyft*) explains, has been recorded as a masculine, feminine, and neuter noun, seems to have been an *i*-stem noun (see A. Campbell 1959: §606), while the cognate nouns in other Germanic languages (e.g. Go. *luftus*, OS *luft*, OHG *luft*, which are also attested with various genders) appear to have been *u*-stem nouns (see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *leup*, Bjorvand and Lindeman 2007: s.v. *loft*, and Orel 2003: s.v. \**luftuz*). It could, however, also be the case that OE *loft* represents a native *a*-stem by-form where \*/u/ has



undergone vowel harmony (see Hogg 1992: §3.10), or a by-form which became associated with *ō*-stem nouns early enough for it to undergo vowel harmony and not to undergo *i*-umlaut (see Hogg 1992: §5.85.2). Thus, the Middle English meaning for the term ‘an upstairs room, upper room’ (see the *MED*: s.v. *loft* sense 1) may simply represent a semantic loan from the Norse term or it may be a native development (cp. MLG *lucht* ‘upper story, attic’). This would explain the unexpected attestation of the term in Ælfric’s *Hexameron* in a phrase (‘on lofte’) which mirrors the common OE ‘on lyfte’ (e.g. Dan 379, And 866, etc.; see further below, 4.2.2).<sup>89</sup> Interestingly, though, as noted by Di Sciacca (Di Sciacca 2012: 179–82), Ælfrician compositions do not record the locative expression with OE *lyft*; this leads her to hypothesize that Ælfric’s *on lofte* may actually represent *á lopt*, a common expression in Scandinavian sources. However, given the existence of the native phrase, it seems unnecessary to assume that the whole phrase has been borrowed.

### 2.3.2.2. Adjectival morphology

(A) OE *ār* ‘early’: This root is attested, not only on its own, but also in various OE complexes (viz. *ārlic* ‘early’, *ārlice* ‘early’, *ārmorgen* ‘dawn, day-break’, *ārmorgenlic* ‘of early morning’). It is only recorded in Northumbrian texts (see further below, I.3), while non-Northumbrian texts record the variant *ǣr* ‘early, former; before’. These terms derive from PGmc *\*airi*, but, while OE *ǣr* (like OFris. / OS / OHG *êr*) seems to represent the comparative degree (PGmc *\*airjaz* > *\*airiz*; cp. Go. *airis*), OE *ār* is likely to represent instead the positive degree (cp. the *OED* 1989: s.vv. *early*, adv. and *ere*, adv., prep. and conj., and Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.v. *er*). Only Old Norse and Gothic record equivalent positive forms (*ár* and *air*, respectively), which, together with the dialectal distribution of the term under consideration, may point towards Norse derivation (see Björkman 1900–02: 200, G. Britton 1957: §314, the *DOE*: s.vv. *ærlic* and *ærlice*, Ross 1982: 197, and Kries 2003: 303). Notably, <a> can represent /æ:/ in Northumbrian texts (cp. <racing> for *ræcing* ‘presenting, seizing, capture’ in JnHeadGl (Li) 45 and <ræcing> in JnHeadGl (Li) 34), and, indeed, the Northumbrian texts do record by-forms with <æ> (e.g. <ærlice> for *ærlice* ‘early’ in JnGl (Li) 8.2, cf. <arlice> in JnGl (Ru) 8.2; cp. ‘æring’ for OE *æring* ‘day-break, dawn’ in MkGl (Li) 1.35 = MkGl (Ru) 1.35 and MkGl (Li) 13.35). Yet the general consistency in the use of by-forms with <a> as far as

<sup>89</sup> On the linguistic features of the eleventh- and twelfth-century manuscripts preserving Ælfric’s *Hexameron*, see Göhler 1933.

the aforementioned compounds are concerned and the fact that there seems to be a distinction between OE *æþ*, which is commonly used to render the Latin conjunction / preposition *ante* ‘before’ (e.g. MkGl (Li) 11.4, LkGl (Li) 2.31), and OE *ār*, which is used adverbially (e.g. it renders L *mane* ‘early in the morning’ in MtGl (Li) 16.3 and LkGl (Ru) 21.1), suggest that the forms with <a> cannot be easily taken as mere spelling alternatives. From this perspective and on the basis of the evidence discussed above, an argument in favour of foreign derivation seems very tempting. However, it could, of course, also be the case that Old Northumbrian was the only Old English dialect to preserve the positive form of the Germanic root (cp. above, 1.3.1), or that, due to chance, it is only attested in these texts as far as Old English is concerned (cp. the *OED* 1989: s.v. *early*, adv.). If this adverb is a loan-word (and it will be treated as such here), it is interesting to see its level of integration in the language, manifested by its productivity (cp. OE *dearf*; see below, 2.4.2.D). The similarity of the adverb with the native cognate must have facilitated this process.

(B) OE *fyrre(r)* ‘earlier, first (of two things)’: The adjective is commonly identified as a loan-word based on the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *fyrri* ‘first’ (cp. Förster 1913: 154 n. 3, Robertson 1939: 502 n. to l. 5, Hofmann 1955: §318, and the *DOE*: s.v. *fyrre*, *fyrre*). The Old Icelandic adjective is a comparative form (< PGmc *\*furiz*) of an adjective for which no positive form is recorded (see Noreen 1923: §438 Anm. 1), although the positive root is represented by OIc *for* / *fyr* ‘before’ (cp. OE *for* / *fore*; < PGmc *\*fur(a)*; see Orel 2003: s.v. *\*fur(a)*). Even though cognate comparative forms are recorded in other West Germanic languages (cp. OHG *furiro* ‘earlier, at the front; bigger, higher’), Old English texts do not otherwise record that grade (cf. OE *fyrrest*, a superlative form, < PGmc *\*furistaz*; see Orel 2003: s.v. *\*furistaz*). The morphological evidence should be associated with the fact that the adjective is only recorded in texts associated with Scandinavianized areas (see below, 3.4.2.14).

### 2.3.2.3. Verbal morphology

(A) OE *tacan* ‘to take, seize’: The attestations of the verb in Old English texts (e.g. inf.: ‘tacan’, in ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.32; 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. sing. pret. ind.: ‘toc’, in ChronD (Cubbin) 1072.13 and ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.32; and 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. pl. pret. ind.: ‘tocon’, in ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.30) make it clear that we are dealing with a Class VI strong verb. The facts that Old Norse appears to be the only language recording a Class VI strong verb derived from an ablaut variant of PIE *\*deH<sub>1</sub>g-* (cp. Go. *tēkan*, a Class VII strong verb; see Kortlandt 2000) and that the attestations of the verb are not only late but also in the main asso-

ciated with Scandinavianized areas (see below, 3.4.2.8.D and 3.4.2.12.A) are generally accepted as an indication that this is a Norse-derived term based on the Viking Age Norse verb recorded as **tuk**, 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. sing. pret. ind., in U 194 and DR 263 (Wessén and B. F. Jansson 1940–58: I, 294–96, and Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 318–19), **toku**, 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. pl. pret. ind., in U 614 (Wessén and B. F. Jansson 1940–58: III, 21–26), and **takit** / **takat**, past part., in U 241 and U 344, respectively (Wessén and B. F. Jansson 1940–58: I, 399–404, and II, 79–86; cp. OIc *taka* ‘to take, catch, seize’; see Björkman 1900–02: 221–22, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *tacan*, Serjeantson 1935: 70–71, the *MED*: s.v. *taken*, Hofmann 1955: §389, de Vries 1961: s.v. *tak*, Peters 1981: 98, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *take*, and Dance 2003: 378).

While the derived verb *oftacan* ‘to catch up with, overtake’ cannot be easily associated with a Norse equivalent (cf. OIc *aftaka* ‘taking away, loss; slaying’) and seems instead to be a native new formation (cp. OE *offēran* ‘to overtake (an enemy)’, *offylgan* ‘to come up with, overtake by pursuit’, *ofirman* ‘to overtake by running’; see Rynell 1948: 46–47), the Norse-derived root appears to have been borrowed as well in some ready-made structures involving the verb and the related noun. On the one hand, various phrasal verbs involving *tacan* are likely to be Norse-derived: e.g. the phrase *tacan on* ‘to touch’ may be based on the Norse phrase represented by OIc *taka á* ‘to touch’,<sup>90</sup> while the combination of the verb with *wið* could mirror OIc *taka við* ‘to receive’ (see also below, IV.2.2.F). On the other hand, the morphological structure of OE *wāpentac* ‘wapentake (subdivision of a shire), equivalent to a *hundred*’ is probably Norse-derived (cp. OIc *vápnatak* ‘weapon-grasping (used to express consent)’; see Björkman 1900–02: 93),<sup>91</sup> although the attribution of the term to an administrative unit appears to be an innovation from Anglo-Scandinavian England (cp. Stenton 1971: 504). As suggested by Kisbye, the semantic process may have been as follows: ‘the action of weapon-grasping in the thing’ > ‘the men attending the thing’ > ‘the area whence those men come’ (Kisbye 1982a: 63). The compound, which is only attested in the *OEC* in texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see below, 3.4.2.2.C.5), is first recorded in LawIVEg 6 as <wāpengetace> (cp. LawNorthu 57.2), the presence of the prefix *ge-* possibly

<sup>90</sup> <ontæcþ> in LS 29 (Nicholas) 288 may have also been influenced by OE *onbrīnan* ‘to touch’, OE (*ge*)*hrīnan* being one of the core members of its lexico-semantic field (see further below, 3.4.2.8.D).

<sup>91</sup> Cp. ch. 30 in the *Leges Edwardi Confessoris*, a tract from the middle of the twelfth century edited by O’Brien 1999. On the Scandinavian practice and the apparent contradiction with legal decrees against having weapons at the thing, see Brink 2002: 90.

having been triggered by its use in similar compounds, such as OE *wæpeneðræc* ‘clash of spears’ and *wæpengewrixl* ‘hostile encounter’. The borrowed term may have been further Anglicized in Ch IWm or IIWm (Salter) 5 through the substitution of /æ/ for /a/ (‘-tæc’), although the presence of the front vowel could instead be attributed to the late date of the document and, hence, the merger of OE /æ/ and /a/ (see Hogg 1992: §§215–16).

## 2.4. *Close Association with the Scandinavian Newcomers and Settlers*

While phonology and morphology can provide quite reliable (albeit with varying degrees) evidence for the Norse derivation of a term, the types of evidence discussed in the remaining sections of this chapter are more problematic (see above, 2.1). Therefore, we should never forget that they do not allow for anything other than the inclusion of the terms amongst those which ‘may be looked upon as *possibly* borrowed from Scandinavian’ (Björkman 1900–02: 226, my emphasis).

This section focuses on the terms whose Norse derivation can be claimed on the basis of their association with the Scandinavian newcomers and settlers, while 2.5 deals with terms whose late and infrequent attestation in Old English is the strongest indicator of a possible Norse origin. This distinction, however, should not be taken as an indicator of the isolation of these sources of evidence. In these two sections, even more than in the previous ones, various types of evidence have to be considered in order to claim Norse derivation.

### 2.4.1. *Reference to the Scandinavian Newcomers and their World*

The Norse derivation of some terms rests, to some extent, on the specific association of the term with the Scandinavian newcomers, their practices, and their ships (cp. OE *hold* and *sumarlida*; see above, 2.2.1.2.E and 2.2.2.3.B). As pointed out above, 2.4, though, other types of evidence, such as the late and infrequent attestation of the term in Old English texts, have to be taken into consideration as well.

(A) OE *cnearr* ‘warship’: This term is commonly interpreted as a Norse-derived loan-word (see Björkman 1900–02: 215, Campbell 1938: 108–09, Hofmann 1955: §231, Niles 1987: 360, Peters 1981: 87, Kisbye 1982a: 47, Simek 1982: 53 and 129, Sayers 1996: 286–87, Heide 2002: 64, Thier 2009: 152–533, etc.). The word that is given as its etymon is the Viking Age Norse noun attested in the dat. sing. as **kniri** in Sö. 49 and U 258 (Brate and Wessén 1924–36: 37–38, and Wessén and B. F. Jansson 1940–58: I, 425–28) and as

**knari** in Sö. 198 (Brate and Wessén 1924–36: 172–75; see Jesch 2001b: 128). The forms in the runic inscriptions can easily be associated with a PGmc nom. sing. *\*knarruz*, a *u*-stem noun (cp. OIc *knorr* ‘warship, cargo ship’; see de Vries 1961: s.v. *knorr*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*knarruz*). If the Old English term is interpreted as a loan-word, the presence of the diphthong can be explained without much trouble. Old Norse *u*-stem nouns combine forms with *u*-umlaut and *i*-umlaut in the paradigm, and we can assume that would have been the case as well during the Viking Age, regardless of whether the umlaut was merely phonetic or had been phonemicized (see above, 1.6.2.1). If we argue that the Old English term derives from an *i*-umlauted form, the presence of breaking could be associated with the fact that Old English speakers, after the operation of breaking, would not have expected to encounter [æ] in the context [CrC]. They would have expected instead [æa] or [e], if the consonant at the onset was palatal and the speakers came from (or were familiar with the speech of) an area where Anglian smoothing had taken place (see Hogg 1992: §5.98) or an area exhibiting palatal monophthongization (see Hogg 1992: §5.119). Thus, the substitution of the diphthong for the fronted monophthong would have been part of the process of adaptation of the term into Old English (cp. ‘mearc’ for OE *marc*; see above, 2.2.1.8.C). If we associate the Old English term instead with the *u*-umlauted forms, the adaptation of the term seems, initially, more problematic. We would have expected the Norse term to be pronounced with a root vowel [ɔ]; therefore, given the form attested in Old English, it is most likely that the Anglo-Saxons would have identified this vowel with OE /a/. Yet, as explained above with regard to restoration of /a/, breaking did not take place in connection with this vowel (see above, 2.2.1.2.D–E). This implies that the Old English speakers are assumed to have broken their phonological laws during the adaptation of this term, whereas their perceived original pronunciation would not have contravened them. However, the improbability of this assumption may be considerably reduced if we bear in mind that, after the operation of breaking, Old English speakers from an area other than (mainly) Northumbria would not have expected to find /a/ in the context /CrC/ either.

There is, however, no need to interpret the term as a loan-word because its phonological structure presents us with the expected reflex of the long-stem masculine *\*knarruz*. Neither Sayers (Sayers 1996) nor Thier (Thier 2002: 43 and 132, and Thier 2009: 153) rejects the association of OIc *knorr* with a group of terms referring to knotty things, all of which start in /kn/ in the various Germanic languages (cp. PDE *knot*, *knob*, *knur*, etc.). ME *knarre* ‘a crag, twisted rock; a swelling or protuberance of the flesh; a knot in wood or trees’ (PDE *knar*), which de Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *knorr*) gives as a cognate of

OIc *knorr*, would have been part of this group as well. Its Old English form, *cnearr*, is probably attested in the place-name *Cnearresweorð* in an eleventh-century record of types of tenure in Yorkshire (Rec 24.1 (Rob 84) 39; see Robertson 1939: 414). This may be the same place-name which is presented in Domesday Book as *Kenaresford* (see Robertson 1939: 416; see also the *VEPN*: s.v. *\*cnearr*). Therefore, we cannot ignore the possibility that OE *cnearr* may be a native form which might have adopted the meaning of its North Germanic cognate (cp. A. Campbell 1938: 108). Indeed, the use of the word-field to refer to a ship type appears to have been typically North Germanic (cp. the Norse-derived loan-words OIr. *cna(i)rr* and OFr. *kenar* and, probably, OHG *gnarrun*; see Sayers 1996: 284–88, Schultze-Thulin 1996: 106, Sayers 2003: 299, Ridel 2004: 155, and Ridel 2009: 237–39).<sup>92</sup> However, arguments *ex silentio* cannot be taken as fully reliable. For instance, OE *fer* and OIc *fár* seem to be the only reflexes of PGmc *\*faran* which mean ‘ship’ (cp. OE *faran* ‘to travel’ and OIc *fara* id.), but they are taken as representing common Germanic usage rather than a semantic loan from one language into the other (see Cronan 2004: 28). Admittedly, the semantic gap between ‘something knotty or gnarled’ and ‘a type of ship’ seems larger than that between ‘travel’ and ‘one specific means of travel, i.e. ship’. Yet the possibility that the terms represent an original Germanic usage cannot be fully ruled out, especially when we also look at the textual attestations of the term.

Most studies dealing with the term mention only its attestation, both as a simplex and as the determinatum of the compound OE *nægledcnearr* (lit. ‘nailed-ship’), in the poem *The Battle of Brunanburh*, where it refers to the Viking ships. Various arguments could be given in favour of the Norse origin of the term, but they are not beyond doubt:

(A.1) Orton points out that ‘it seems unlikely that we shall ever be able to say something very definite about the dialect in which the poem was originally composed’ (Orton 1994: 22). However, Cavill and others (Cavill and others 2003–04), while clarifying the reference to *Dingesmere* in the poem and arguing in favour of identifying the site of the battle with Bomborough in the Wirral, have suggested that the poet is likely to have been fairly familiar with the terrain and the surroundings of the battle-place. This may indicate that the original composition should be attributed to a poet from an area with a sig-

<sup>92</sup> As suggested by Katrin Thier (personal communication), OHG *gnarrun* seems to represent a dative plural etymon. It is attested in the eleventh-century compilation *Summarium Heinrici* (see Hildebrandt 1974–95: I, 361.253).



nificant Scandinavian presence (see Jesch 2000) who may have used a term for a Viking ship s/he was familiar with.<sup>93</sup> The West Saxon scribe of the A-text of the *Chronicle* copied <cnearen> instead of the intended <cnear on> in Brun 35, and this is one of the features that Orton explains as ‘the sort of mangling of words which might result when a scribe tries to write a partly unfamiliar version of his own language to dictation’ (Orton 1994: 23). We could add in this case that the term itself may also have been ‘partly unfamiliar’ to the scribe. However, the scribe also makes mistakes with words the native origin of which is not beyond doubt.

(A.2) Even if the text had been composed by a West Saxon poet without much contact (either directly or indirectly) with the Scandinavian newcomers (cp. Orton 1994: 22), the presence of a Norse-derived nautical term in a text which can be dated to 937 x c. 955, when it was entered in the A-manuscript of the *Chronicle* (see Bately 1986: xxxiv–xxxv, and Orton 1994: 18–19), may not seem out of place given its technical character.<sup>94</sup> There have been attempts to identify more Norse-derived terms and structures in the poem; however, there is not much evidence to support them (see, for instance, below, III.4.L, III.4.Z, III.4.EE, III.4.GG, and III.4.HHH).

(A.3) Sayers interprets the compound OE *nægledcnearr* as being fully in line with his argument that it is not because the Scandinavian ships were made with knotty wood that they were referred to with a term associated with knotty or gnarled things, but rather ‘because of the visual impression created by the heads of rows of rivets that at regular intervals of six or eight inches joined the strakes and, more tightly grouped, secured the scarf of composite strakes’ (Sayers 1996: 283). Yet we need to remember that OE *nægled-* as the determinant of a compound referring to a ship is also attested in OE *nægledbord* ‘with nailed sides’ and *nægledsinc* ‘studded vessel’ (cp. Sayers 1996: 287 n. 15).<sup>95</sup>

(A.4) The fact that the term is seemingly used to refer to the Viking ships may suggest its Norse derivation because it could have been used as a characterizing term (cp. Sayers 1996: 287, and Carroll 2001: 101 n. 84). However, we need to consider that, on the one hand, OE *lid*, a native term, is also used to

<sup>93</sup> Even if the poet was someone from Æthelstan’s court, s/he may not have been completely free from the influence of Old Norse speakers, for the King’s court seems to have been a centre of Anglo-Scandinavian contact (see Townend 2000a: 356).

<sup>94</sup> For a recent suggestion that the text might be the work of Æthelwold, bishop of Abingdon (c. 954–63) and bishop of Winchester (963–84), see Bredehoft 2009: 125–27.

<sup>95</sup> More recently, Heide has argued that the original meaning of the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *knorr* was ‘a ship with a backwards curved stem’ (Heide 2002: 60–67).

refer to the Viking ships, and, on the other hand, the poem does not mention the ships of the West Saxon king and his followers and hence we do not know whether the poet would have been happy to apply the term to them as well.

With the important exception of Thier (Thier 2002: 43), studies dealing with OE *cnearr* do not tend to note that ‘cnearrum’ renders L *navibus actuariis* (cp. L *navis actuario* ‘swift ship’) in London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius C.ii (OccGl 45.1.2 (Meritt) 20). While Ker (Ker 1990: no. 198) does not hypothesize where these glosses to Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica gentis anglorum* may have been entered, Meritt (Meritt 1933: 307) points out that both the ink and the scratched glosses exhibit Kenticisms. This is in keeping with Gneuss’s suggestion (Gneuss 2001: no. 377) that the manuscript may have been glossed in Canterbury. With regard to the date of the scratched glosses, Meritt concludes that ‘none of the glosses are later than the tenth century’ (Meritt 1933: 307 n. 8; cp. Ker 1990: no. 198). A case for the presence of a technical Norse-derived noun in tenth-century Canterbury could be made, especially if the glosses are assigned to the later part of the century (cp. above, 2.2.1.7.A.5, and below, 2.5.C). After all, Ælfric also used the compound *scegðmann* (see below, 3.4.2.5.B).

In conclusion, neither the form nor the textual attestations of the term are necessarily suggestive of a Norse origin. In this case, the seemingly Norse meaning associated with it may be a stronger indicator that we are dealing with a Norse-derived term. Whether it is a loan-word or a semantic loan has to remain unsolved.

(B) OE *eorl* ‘brave man, warrior’: When used as a synonym of OE *ealdor-mann* ‘chief officer of a shire’, this term first appears only in relation to the Scandinavian newcomers or men with Scandinavian names (e.g. the various occurrences in ChronA (Bately) 871; see below, I.26.1.1.D).<sup>96</sup> While the use of OE *eorl* with this meaning to refer to people who have no relation with the Scandinavian newcomers is particularly common after 1017, when Cnut is said to have divided the kingdom into four parts, it can also be found in texts by Archbishop Wulfstan II of York which are likely to have been composed before that date (see the DOE: s.v. *eorl*, and Pons-Sanz 2007b: 176–81; see further below, 3.4.2.6.A.4 and 4.2.4). This semantic change has been associated with the influence of its Norse cognate, attested as *iarls*, gen. sing., in U 617 and Sm.

<sup>96</sup> Æthelweard renders the term in his *Chronicon* as *consules* and explains that it refers to those whom ‘illi eorlas solent nominare’ (‘they usually call earls’) (A. Campbell 1962: 34); see Townend 2002: 111.



76 (Wessén and B. F. Jansson 1940–58: III, 28–39, and Kinander 1935–61: 194–96; cp. OIc *jarl* ‘earl; poet. a high-born noble man or warrior’; see, for instance, Björkman 1900–02: 236, Hofmann 1955: §221, Peters 1981: 94, Kisbye 1982b: 57, and Dance 2003: 419). However, Syrett (Syrett 2002: 47 n. 141) has recently voiced some concerns about attributing the new meaning of the native term to Norse influence. The meaning for the Norse term which concerns us here is most securely recorded in prose texts from the twelfth century, while some skaldic poems from the eleventh century only record the term in its wider meaning, viz. ‘(noble) man’, which Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §116) analyses as a semantic loan from OE *eorl* or OS *erl*.<sup>97</sup> Syrett (Syrett 2002: 47–48) explains that the evidence suggesting that *jarl* referred to a specific post of a subordinate of a king in late Viking Age Scandinavia is very vague and elusive; instead, what we find is the term being applied to prestigious landed dynasties whose status and power were rather more similar to that of kings during the Viking Age (see further Bøe and others 1962; see also Bolton 2009: 191–92). Despite these caveats, given that there is no strong evidence against the Norse derivation of the meaning, this work follows general opinion in accepting it as a semantic loan.

OE *eorl* with the Norse meaning is attested in three compounds, viz. OE *eorlgyfu* ‘grace, indulgence, gift of an *eorl*’, *eorlriht* ‘right or privilege of an *eorl*’, and *eorldōm* ‘earldom, the dignity of office of an *eorl*; the people, liegemen of an earldom’. The first two compounds are only attested in texts by Archbishop Wulfstan II of York (see below, I.26.3 and I.26.4), which suggests that he may be the mind behind their coinage (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 181). OE *eorldōm* is recorded both in his works and outside them (see below, I.26.2). This compound could be a Norse-derived loan-translation (cp. OIc *jarldómr* ‘earldom’) or a native new formation following the same type as OE *ealdordōm* ‘power, lordship, dominion’, *cynedōm* ‘royal dignity, kingly rule’, and *ðēowdōm* ‘slavery’. The two options need not be irreconcilable because the existence of a native type may have facilitated the creation of a loan-translation.

(C) OE *holm* ‘wave, sea, ocean’: The meaning ‘small island in a river’ for this term, recorded in ChronE (Irvine) 1025.2 (= ChronF (Baker) 1025.2), is commonly believed to have been borrowed from the Norse cognate (cp. OIc *holmr* ‘islet’; see Björkman 1900–02: 243, Hofmann 1955: §333, A. H. Smith

<sup>97</sup> As explained by Ó Corráin 1987: 288, the Norse-derived term *iarla* is similarly first recorded in Irish sources referring to military leaders highly impressive in their effectiveness. For a similar argument in favour of Norse derivation, this time in association with OFris. *jarla*, see Miedma 1978.

1970: s.v. *holmr*, Kniezsa 1994: 241, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *holm*, *holme*1). We need to bear in mind, though, that a similar meaning is attested for MHG and MLG *holm*, viz. 'island in a river' (see de Vries 1961: s.v. *holmi*).<sup>98</sup> Notably, ChronE (Irvine) 1025 reports some events which took place in Scandinavia, and Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §333) suggests that the whole phrase where OE *holm* is included, viz. 'to þam holme æt ea þære halgan' ('to the island at the Holy River') shows Norse-derived word order (cp. OIc *á in halga* 'river Helgeá', in Skåne, as recorded in stanza 11 of the poem *Knútsdrápa*, attributed to the eleventh-century Icelandic skald Ottar svarti; see Jónsson 1912: 298). Hofmann points out that the word-order noun + article + adjective is only recorded in Old English in poetry (e.g. 'sele þam hean' in Beo 713, and 'beorh þone hean' in Beo 3097), not in prose. However, Mitchell (Mitchell 1985: §126) does find examples of this word order in prose texts (e.g. 'cyle þone grimmetan' in HomS 17 (BlHom 5) 137). Although it is not necessarily the case, this annal could have been based on some sort of report from Cnut's Scandinavianized court, a report which may be somehow related to Ottar svarti's sources.<sup>99</sup>

(D) OE *hūsting* 'indoors assembly; tribunal, court': This compound is only recorded, as far as the *OEC* is concerned, in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1012 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1012 = ChronE (Irvine) 1012 = ChronF (Baker) 1012 (cp. 'consilium suum' ('their council') in ChronF (Baker) 1012.28), where it refers to the assembly of the Scandinavian marauders where Archbishop Ælfheah was pelted with bones and ox-heads because he had refused to let ransom be paid for his liberation (on the character of this assembly, see below, 3.4.2.2.C.4); and in Ch 1465 (Rob 86) 18, a document from c. 1032, where it refers to the court of London. The compound is commonly identified as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *húsping* 'council, meeting (held by the king, earl or other leader for their immediate followers)', possibly < OIc *húskarlaping*; see Steenstrup 1882: 175–76, Björkman 1900–02: 214, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *hūs-ting*, Carr 1939: 29, Robertson 1939: 420 n. to l. 24, the *MED*: s.v. *hūs-ting*, Hofmann 1955: §307, Peters 1981: 90, Kisbye 1982a: 54, Nightingale 1987: 559, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *husting*, Kniezsa 1994: 241, and Dance 2003: 361).

<sup>98</sup> On the impossibility of knowing the dialectal origin of the term which influenced the native cognate, see Dance 2003: 424. On the common use of this term in place-names, see Hug 1987: 259; it may be the case that the seemingly Norse meaning is already present in Holm, recorded in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 902.2.2, which is part of the Mercian Register (see Swanton 2000: 93 n. 14, and 156 n. 8).

<sup>99</sup> On the suggestion that Ottar svarti is likely to have composed his *Knútsdrápa* in England or for an audience in England, see Hofmann 1955: §§71–72, and Frank 1994: 108–09.

Evidence in favour of this derivation could be extracted from linguistic and extralinguistic sources. From a linguistic perspective, nothing in the form of the compound can be put forward as strongly suggesting Norse rather than native origin (cp. Steenstrup 1882: 175–76, and P. Sawyer 1986: 190; see K. Brunner 1965: §201.6 on the Old English sound change /sθ/ > /st/). Any argument in favour of its Norse derivation has to rely on the fact that, although OE *ðing* meaning ‘assembly’ is recorded in Old English legal and poetic texts (see Stanley 1979 and Pantos 2004), the prose records of the term are restricted to early law-codes, viz. LawHl 8, while the usual word for any meeting or gathering appears to have been OE *gemōt* (see Pantos 2004: 182–83). Accordingly, we could suggest that the use of OE *ðing* to refer to an assembly was either reintroduced from or reinvigorated by Norse usage (cp. Kisbye 1982a: 52); yet it is important to remember that ‘its use in poetry and appearance in compounds suggests that *þing* was still understood by speakers of late OE and it is possible that it remained an active [place-]name-forming element, despite being absent from the prose vocabulary’ (Pantos 2004: 183).<sup>100</sup> Indeed, the legal association of the term is further recorded, among other contexts, in PPs (prose) 34.22 and ChronE (Irvine) 1022.9, where it means ‘a matter brought before a court of law; a legal process; a charge brought, a suit or cause pleaded before a court’ (see the OED 1989: s.v. *thing*, n.1, sense 2a). From an extralinguistic perspective, the only argument in favour of its Norse derivation is its association with the Scandinavian marauders in the *Chronicle*. Nightingale suggests that ‘the chronicler was using a Danish name for what he saw as an assembly of invaders, much as in 1940 the Londoners adopted the German word “blitz”’ (Nightingale 1987: 562; cp. McDougall 1993: 222–23, and Dance 2003: 86). This argument could be supported by the fact that the 1012-annal does not make any reference to the infamous assembly having actually taken place indoors, and, indeed, if OIc *hústing* derives from OIc *húskarlaping*, the compound would have originally referred to the relationship between those involved, and not to the place where the meeting took place. Thus, it could be the case that the compound was interpreted in England as a whole, rather than as a sum of its components. This, however, could be counteracted by the facts that the compound has undergone at least some analysis, as shown by the process of dissimilation, and that the reference to the assembly being indoors could be implied, given the determinant of the compound and the fact that the Anglo-Saxons seem

<sup>100</sup> On the possible presence of OE *ðing*, either the native or the Norse-derived term, in *Dingesmere* (Brun 56), see Cavill and others 2003–04.

to have been familiar with indoors assemblies (see Pantos 2004: 191–92). It is clear, then, that the suggestion that the Norse-derived term was used in connection with the exoticism of the assembly, though tempting (see further below, 3.4.2.2.C.4), is difficult to prove. Furthermore, we need to remember that there is no clear connection between the Husting in London and the Scandinavians. Nightingale, taking for granted the Norse-derived character of the compound, explains that the use of OE *hūsting* in that context ‘would seem to be little more than a new Danish name for a much older institution’ (Nightingale 1987: 562, 653). She considers that the London assembly would have adopted that name either when Cnut came to the throne or when the city was placed under the authority of a Danish commander in 1016 (Nightingale 1987: 652–54); thus, a Danish military leader would have replaced the sheriff or portreeve as president of the city assembly. The connection between Scandinavian activities and the name of the London assembly, therefore, rests on the assumption that this is a Norse-derived term, and we have to be careful not to use this as evidence for the Norse derivation of the term because we would then engage in a circular argument. In a nutshell, any argument in favour of the Norse origin of the term has to rely on the predominantly poetic use of OE *ðing* meaning ‘assembly’ and the apparent initial association of the compound with the Scandinavians. These factors may point towards the Norse derivation of the compound, but this etymological explanation is by no means beyond doubt.

(E) OE *lagu* ‘law’: This term is commonly analysed as a Norse-derived loan-word (see below), and its etymon is generally believed to be VAN *\*lagu* (< PGmc *\*laʒō*, nom. pl., cp. OIc *log* ‘law’, sing. OIc *lag* ‘layer’; see Townend 2002: 203, and Dance 2003: 364).<sup>101</sup> However, other Germanic languages, including Old English, record related nouns (e.g. OE *geleag* ‘extension, area’, OE *ealdorleagu* ‘destiny, death’, OE *feorhlegu* ‘death, course of one’s life’, OS *gilagu* (neut. pl.) ‘fate, determination’, OE *orlag* ‘destiny’, OHG *urlag* id., and OS *orlag* id., and OHG *legar* ‘act of lying down, disease’, OS *legar* id., and OE *leger* id.), as well as the etymologically related verbs OE *licgan* (PDE *lie*) / OS *liggian* / OHG *liggen* / OFris. *liga*, *lidza* (cp. OIc *liggja*) and its causative OE *lecgan* (PDE *lay*) / OS *leggian* / OHG *leggen* / OFris. *ledza* (cp. OIc *leggja*; see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *legb-*, de Vries 1961: s.vv. *leggja*, *liggja*, and *log*, and Bjorvand and Lindeman 2007: s.v. *lov1*). It could therefore be the case that we are dealing with a semantic loan rather than a loan-word or with a fully native term. Yet the facts that OE *lagu* meaning ‘law’ is first attested in the tenth cen-

<sup>101</sup> On the phonological form of the Viking Age Norse etymon, see above, 1.6.2.1.

ture and that it is believed that, in its earliest records, it is solely associated with the Scandinavian newcomers and their legal practices (LawIVeg 2a.1, 12, 13.1; see further A. Fischer 1989, and below, II.203) are generally considered to be sufficient evidence so as to identify it with reasonable confidence as a Norse-derived loan-word. Thus, it is not missing from any survey of Norse-derived vocabulary in English (see, for instance, Björkman 1900–02: 249, Hofmann 1955: §§204, 206, 209, 284, Peters 1981: 90, Kisbye 1982a: 51, Townend 2002: 203, and Dance 2003: 364). We need to bear in mind, though, that Langefeld's and Drout's recent dating of the Old English translation of the enlarged Rule of Chrodegang de Metz, which records OE *lagu* without any specific association with the Scandinavian newcomers, c. 960 throws some doubt on the reasons behind the etymological analysis of the term (Langefeld 2003, Drout 2004, and Drout 2006). Given that the translation of the Rule has traditionally been dated to c. 1000, that the use of OE *lagu* could be associated instead with the date of the only manuscript recording the virtually complete text (i.e. with the late eleventh century; see below, II.162), and that the Norse derivation of OE *lagu* is generally accepted, the term is here also considered to be a Norse-derived loan-word, but the other possibilities cannot be fully ruled out.

The feminine gender of the native *lagu* and the native synonyms of the Norse-derived term OE *ǣ(w)* 'law; marriage; wife' and OE *āsetnes* 'institute, law', together with the ending *\*-u* in the etymon (the common nom. sing. ending for Old English short-syllable *ō*-stem nouns; see A. Campbell 1959: §§585–86), would have contributed to the adoption of the term as a feminine noun instead of a neuter noun like its etymon (cp. Welna 1980: 407). It became Anglicized very quickly, as suggested by the size of its word-field. While some of the members are only recorded in texts composed by Archbishop Wulfstan II of York or under his influence, which is a high indication of his coinage of the terms (viz. OE *folclagu* 'law of the people, public law', *griðlagu* 'law of temporary or local peace', *mæglagu* 'law as to relatives', *rihtlagu* 'right law', *lahbryce* 'breach of the law', *lahriht* 'legal right, law', *lahwita* 'lawyer', *lahgewrit* 'legal writing', *regollagu* 'monastic law', *ðegnlagu* 'rights, duties or privileges of a thane', *woruldlagu* 'worldly law'), others may be native new formations or Norse-derived loan-blends (OE *ǣlagol* 'law-giving'; OE *burhlagu* 'civil law', cp. OE *burhriht* 'urban law'; OE *lahcōp* / *cēap* 'money paid for legal rights; lawful bargain?', cp. OIc *lōgkaup* 'lawful bargain'; OE *lahbreca* 'law-breaker, impious man', and *lahbrecende* 'impious', cp. OE *ǣwbræce* 'despising the law, adulterous', *ǣwbreca* 'adulterer', and *ǣwbryce* 'adultery'; OE *lagian* 'to ordain'; OE *lahlic* 'lawful', cp. OE *rihtlic* 'right, proper' and *ǣwlic* 'legal, lawful', and OIc *lōgligr*

'lawful'; OE *lahlice* 'lawfully', cp. OE *rihtlice* 'justly, properly' and OIc *logliga* 'lawfully'; OE *lahmann* 'law-man', cp. OIc *logmaðr* 'law-man'; OE *lahslite* 'fine paid for the breach of the law', cp. OE *æslitend* 'law-breaker', and OSwed. *lahgslit* 'a failure to comply with an obligation; fine in compensation for this failure'; OE *landlagu* 'local law', cp. OE *landriht* 'right to own or occupy land'; OE *prēostlagu* 'ecclesiastical law, canon law'; OE *unlagagiæld* 'unjust taxation'; OE *unlagu* 'bad law, injustice', cp. OE *unriht* 'injustice', and OIc *úlog* 'illegality, injustice, breach of the law').<sup>102</sup>

OE *ūtlah* 'outlawed' is generally analysed as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *útlagr* 'outlawed', related to OIc *leggja*; see Björkman 1900–02: 224, Hofmann 1955: §209, de Vries 1961: s.v. *útlagr*, and Peters 1981: 91). The term is related to OE *ūtlaga*, which may be a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *útlagi* 'outlaw'; see Björkman 1900–02: 224, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *ūtlaga*, and Dance 2003: 382) or a native new formation on the basis of the adjective (see Hofmann 1955: §217, Peters 1982: 93, and Kastovsky 1992: 334), and the English new formations *ūtlagian* 'to outlaw', *inlagian* 'to reverse a sentence of outlawry', and *ūtlagu* 'outlawry'. While OE *inlagian* cannot be directly associated with any attested Norse verb, OE *ūtlagian* could derive from the verbs represented by OIc *útlægja* 'to banish', *útlaga* 'to deprive one of his possessions', or *útlagask* 'to be fined'. However, Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §268, cp. §217) argues that, while OIc *útlægja* represents a different etymon (cp. OIc *útlagr* 'banished, outlawed' and *lægja* 'to lower, humble'), the meanings of the two other verbs are not closely associated with that of OE *ūtlagian*. Albeit only indirectly related to OE *lagu* from an etymological perspective (cp. Wennström 1933: 80–83, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *útlagr*), these terms deserve to be dealt with in this section in connection with the *lagu* word-field because, when analysing OIc *útlagi*, Logeman explains that

from the very first when the English borrowed it, they must have connected it with *lagu* [...]. For, if they had [...] recognised it as being connected with *leggja* [...], then no doubt we should have found traces of a change of form in the direction to \*out-lay. Whether such a conception ever crossed the mind of anyone in those times we have, of course, no means of determining; all we can say is that the extant forms do not point to it. (Logeman 1906: 270–71; cp. Hofmann 1955: §209)

<sup>102</sup> On the OE *lagu* word-field, particularly in Wulfstanian compositions, see further Pons-Sanz 2007b: ch. 3, 221–23 and 232–33. On the attestation of the compound OE 'lageman' as a by-name in Domesday Book, see Tengvik 1938: 257. This is, of course, also the name of the author of the Middle English translation of Wace's *Roman de Brut*; see Frankis 2004.



Thus, Ælfric gives OE *ūtlaga* as an equivalent to OE *būtan æ* ‘outside the law’ when rendering L *exlex* ‘outlaw’ (ÆGram 70.5–6 and 276.6–7).

Changes in the character of outlawry in Anglo-Saxon England from a less important legal process reserved for exceptional offences and only applicable to one’s shire to a fundamental coercive element in the hands of the king applicable to the whole country (see Jolliffe 1947: 107–08, and Lundgren 1996: ch. 1, with references) have sometimes been associated with the arrival of the Scandinavian newcomers (see Steenstrup 1882: 252, Pollock 1893: 254, Liebermann 1910, and de Lange 1935: 124–25). However, this remains a difficult issue, and it may simply be the case that this process was associated with the general increase in Anglo-Saxon royal power, as implicitly suggested by Jolliffe (Jolliffe 1947: 107–08) and Lundgren (Lundgren 1996: ch. 1; see also van Houts 2004).<sup>103</sup> Thus, this extralinguistic factor cannot be straightforwardly presented as evidence in favour of the introduction of the Norse loan-word.

(F) OE *lȳsing* ‘freedman’: The association of VAN *\*lōysingi* ‘freedman’ (cp. OIc *leysingi*) with the native OE *liesan* ‘to loosen, release, redeem’ offers a very good explanation for ‘liesengum’ in LawAGu 2 (cf. ME *laisen*, cp. OIc *leysa* ‘to loose, loosen’). Given the influence of folk etymology, nothing in the form of the noun suggests Norse origin (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 11). However, an argument in favour of its foreign origin can rely on various factors. Personal and place-names are recorded with clear reflexes of the Norse diphthong (see Fellows-Jensen 1968: 186–87, and Hadley 2000b: 179; cp. 2.2.1.3); yet, it could be argued that we are facing two by-forms, one with a native origin and another Norse-derived. Two related facts make this suggestion quite problematic, though: (1) the term seems to refer, at least in its first attestation, to a specific social class of the Scandinavian newcomers, the *leysingar* being the highest of the two categories of manumitted slaves (see Pelteret 1995: 297–98; cp. Kershaw 2000: 48 and 55; cf. OE *healffrēo*, see below, III.3.1.C);<sup>104</sup> and (2) the term is only recorded in texts from a period when the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact was already taking place.

(G) OE *mund* ‘money paid by bridegroom to bride’s father, bridegroom’s gift to bride’: When OE *mund* is recorded with the meanings ‘hand; security, protection’ (see below, 3.4.2.2.D), it is a feminine noun. It is, however, recorded as a masculine noun on two occasions (viz. ChristA,B,C 93, and

<sup>103</sup> On OE *fēolaga*, which is etymologically related to these terms, see below, 2.4.2.I.

<sup>104</sup> The differences between these two classes of freedmen seem to have been associated with the *leysingar*’s freedom to marry and to dispose of their property.

Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 36, a charter from East Anglia, on which see below, II.156). Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 195 n. to l. 6), who does not mention the ChristA,B,C context, notes that OE *mund* in the charter means ‘price to be paid before the marriage, originally to the bride’s guardian’, and argues that the whole expression where it appears, viz. ‘to mund and to maldage’, is Norse-derived (see above, 2.2.1.7.A.3) and that OE *mund* in this context is a Norse-derived semantic loan based on the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *mundr* ‘the sum which the bride groom had to pay for his bride, and which after the wedding became her own property’. Her suggestion has generally been accepted by later scholars (see Olszewska 1933: 79 and 83, Hofmann 1955: §322, Peters 1981: 90, and McKinney 1994: 28 n. 1) and, indeed, seems quite likely on the basis of the very limited attestation of the term with this uncommon meaning. We should, however, bear in mind that OE *mund* in ChristA,B,C 93 seems to mean ‘virginity, virgin state’ (cp. Bradley 1982: 208), a meaning clearly associated with ‘dowry’, and that, furthermore, Old Frisian records *mond* as an ‘old masculine form’ meaning ‘dowry’ together with a *new* masculine form meaning ‘protector, guardian’ (see Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.vv. *mon(d)* 1 and *mon(d)* 2). Thus, when these two factors are taken together, it is not easy to discount completely the possibility that the meaning under consideration might have developed by fully native means (cp. Holthausen 1934: s.v. *mund* 1, de Vries 1961: s.v. *mundr*, and Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.v. *mon(d)* 1; cf. above, 2.1).

(H) OE *norren* ‘northern’: The adjective is only attested three times in the *OEC*, all in the same annal of northern provenance and always referring to the Norwegian Harold Hardrada (see below, I.64 and 3.4.2.8.A.3). The adjective is formally more similar to the Norse term represented by OIc *norraenn* ‘northern’ (< *nordrænn*; cp. OHG *nordrôni* ‘northern’; see Noreen 1923: §297.3) than to the cognate OE *norðerne*, which suggests that it is likely to be a Norse loan-word (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 217, Hofmann 1955: §370, de Vries 1961: s.v. *norraenn*, and Peters 1981: 97).<sup>105</sup> However, while the Norse adjective would have had a long mid-vowel, the loan-word seems to have had a short vowel, as suggested by the syncopated ‘norna’ in ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.35 (cp. Hofmann 1955: §370).

<sup>105</sup> Cp. L *Norrenses* in the Waverley Annals in the same context where the E-text has ‘norðerne men’ (ChronE (Irvine) 1064) and the D-text has ‘ryðrenan’ (see above, note 63 in this chapter); see Luard 1864–69: II, 188, and Irvine 2004: lxxxiv. On the relationship between the E-version of the *Chronicle* and the Waverley Annals, see below, 4.2.1.



## 2.4.2. Dialectal Distribution

Besides some of the words which have already been discussed (viz. OE *ār*, *brȳdhlōp*, *brynige*, *cōp*, *eggian*, *fēstermann*, *flēge*, *fra*, *fyrre(r)*, *hānum*, *hold*, *māldæg*, (*healf*)*marc*, *norren*, *ōra* (*ȳre* / *ēre*), *rennan*, *sandermann*, *sceppe*, *scēr*, *scoru*, *tacan*, *toft*, *ðīr*, *ðorp*, *wāpentac*, and *wæð*; see above, 2.2–3 and 2.4.1.G), the following terms could be attributed a Norse origin on the basis of their dialectal distribution.

(A) OE *ǣlding* ‘combustion, fuel’: It is only recorded, as far as the *OEC* is concerned, in Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8), a document associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see below, II.239), where it is spelt <hældiggæ>. Förster identified it as a loan-word based on the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *elding* ‘warming; fire, flame’ (Förster 1913: 152 and 154 n. 4), and this suggestion has been echoed by Robertson (Robertson 1939: 502 n. to l. 5) and Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §318; see also de Vries 1961: s.v. *elding*). Old English texts record OE *ǣled* ‘fire’, and accordingly, the noun under consideration could be understood as a native derivative. However, the dialectal distribution of the term both in Old English and later texts (see the *EDD*: s.v. *elding*, Thorson 1936: 59, the *MED*: s.v. *elding*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *elding*<sup>1</sup>, and Kries 2003: 98) may point towards a Norse origin.

(B) OE ‘(h)ærflæ’ (*ærfle?*, *erfle?*, *erfel?*): Förster (Förster 1913: 152 and 155–56) identified this noun, which, like the previous term, is only recorded in the *OEC* in Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8), as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *erfiol* ‘funeral feast’; cp. Robertson 1939: 502 n. to l. 5, and Hofmann 1955: §318). OIc *erfi* ‘funeral feast’ (< PGmc \**arbjan*) is cognate with WS *yrfe* / nWS *erfe* ‘inheritance’. However, the semantic difference between the Norse and the English terms (but note OE *yrfan*, which has as one of its meanings ‘to hold a wake, honour with a funeral feast’, see Toller 1921: Add. s.v. *irfan*; see further Grønvik 1982),<sup>106</sup> the fact that the compound is not otherwise attested in Old English texts (if Förster’s analysis is correct), and the dialectal distribution of the term in Old English and later texts (see the *EDD*: s.v. *arval*, Thorson 1936: 53, the *MED*: s.v. *arvel*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *arval*, -*el*, -*ill*) argue in favour of analysing the term as Norse-derived.

(C) OE *bāðe* ‘both’: The fact that this particle is probably first recorded in the First Continuation to the *Peterborough Chronicle* (but see below, IV.1.2

<sup>106</sup> On the relationship between the meanings ‘inheritance’ and ‘to hold a wake, honour with a funeral feast’ for the native word-field, see further Vázquez González 2004.

and IV.2.3.2.A), while other Old English texts do not record the union of *bā* ‘both’ and *ðā* ‘those’ as a single term, is sometimes taken as evidence in favour of the Norse derivation of the form under discussion (cp. **baþir**, nom. masc. pl., in U 304, U 336, **baþa**, acc. masc. pl., in Ög. 107, Sö. 178, etc.; Wessén and B. F. Jansson 1940–58: II, 11–12 and 68–69, Brate 1911–18: 107, and Brate and Wessén 1924–36: 151–53, respectively; cp. OIc *báðir* ‘both’; see Kniezsa 1994: 241, the *OED* 1989: *both*, a. and adv., and Dance 2003: 411). However, other West Germanic languages show the same tendency towards the union of a reflex of the pronominal element PGmc *\*bai* and the demonstrative pronoun (cp. OFris. *bêthe* ‘both’, OS *bethia* id., OHG *beide* / *bêde* id.; see Ross and Berns 1992: 575, and Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.v. *bêthe*), and, accordingly, the structure under consideration may be a native formation the popularity of which was increased by the Norse equivalent (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 108, Serjeantson 1935: 75, the *MED*: s.v. *bōthe*, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *báðir*).

(D) OE *dearf* ‘bold, audacious, presumptuous’: This term is commonly identified as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *djarfi* ‘bold, daring’; see Björkman 1900–02: 233, Jordan 1907: 37, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *dearf*, the *MED*: s.v. *derf*, adj., Hofmann 1955: §239, Peters 1981: 96, Ross 1982: 197, the *DOE*: s.v. *dearf*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *derf*, Dance 2003: 348, and Pons-Sanz 2004).<sup>107</sup> This analysis is based on two issues:

(D.1) As far as the *OEC* is concerned, the term is mainly attested in northern texts, particularly in the Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Durham Ritual, where the derivatives *dearflic* ‘a bold or reckless person’ and *dearfscipe* ‘audacity, rashness’ are also recorded (see below, 3.4.2.10.A.1 and 4.3.1; cp. the *EDD*: s.v. *derf*, the *MED*: s.v. *derf*, adj., and Kries 2003: 154).

(D.2) It is sometimes argued that, while the cognate adjectives in other Germanic languages derive from PGmc *\*ðarbjaz* (cp. OS *derbi* / OFris. *derve* ‘tough, strong, hostile, wicked’), the Norse term is the only attested adjective derived from the ablaut variant *\*ðerbaz*, /ja/ being the result of breaking and stress shift (see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *dherebbh*, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *djarfi*; on Norse /ja/, see Noreen 1913: §28.b, and Noreen 1923: §§87–96). However, more recently all the cognate adjectives have been derived from PGmc *\*ðerbaz* (see Heidemanns 1993: 152–53 s.v. *derba*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*ðerbaz*). If the latter view is accepted, we would expect a native English adjective to be

<sup>107</sup> The Viking Age Norse adjective is attested on several occasions as a personal noun either on its own or as part of a compound in runic inscriptions: e.g. **tirfr** and **tiarfr**, nom. sing., in Sö. 112 (Brate and Wessén 1924–36: 84).

recorded with <eo> instead of <ea>, following the breaking of /e/ (see Hogg 1992: §5.22). We do indeed find <deorf> for the adjective (Ch IWm (Galbraith 2) 9 and the Middle English text Ch 1110 (Harm 62) 26; cp. <deort> in Ch IWm (Farrer 89) 9 and <dorf> in Ch IWm (Galbraith 3) 8, which relies on Ch IWm (Galbraith 2) 9, as suggested below, II.17.1.13; cp. <ðeorif> in the Middle English text Ch 1243 (Harm 121) 11; see below, IV.2.3.2.B), as well as for the adverb OE *dearflice* ‘boldly’ in LS 29 (Nicholas) 383; and <eo> not <ea> is the spelling for the adjective favoured by Heidermanns (Heidermanns 1993) and Orel (Orel 2003). These spellings, except for <deort> and <deorif>, are attested in texts associated with areas other than Northumbria (see below, II.15.2.14, II.17.1.12–13, and II.226). Thus, the presence of <ea> in the Aldredian glosses may not have to be explained, as Ross (Ross 1939–40: 10) suggests, by association with the fact that, by the time when the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact took place, the first element of the Norse compound had not been raised yet (nor had stress-shift probably taken place). Instead, the Aldredian spellings could simply be explained by referring to the fact that Aldred’s dialect tends to show <ea> for <eo> (see Hogg 1992: §5.44).<sup>108</sup> Similarly, if we took OE *deorf* as the common form, we would not need to rely on the influence of OE *gedeorf* ‘labour, difficulty’ to explain the common attestation of the adjective with <e> in Middle English texts (see the *MED*: s.v. *derf*, adj., senses 3 and 4, Pons-Sanz 2000: 93, and Dance 2003: 348). However, the <eo> spellings are not fully reliable because all the texts recording them have come down to us in manuscripts written during the Middle English period.<sup>109</sup>

Besides the dialectal distribution of the initial attestations of the adjective, the distribution of its meanings during the Middle English period may also be suggestive of Norse derivation. Texts from Scandinavianized areas tend to record the same meaning for the adjective as that of the Norse term, while texts from the South-West Midlands attest for the adjective the meanings ‘fierce, dreadful, wicked’ and ‘hard, difficult’ (see the *MED*: s.v. *derf*, adj.). Texts from

<sup>108</sup> Unfortunately, the equivalent contexts to those where Aldred used this word-field were rendered by Farman in the Rushworth Gospels (see Pons-Sanz 2004: 184); we, therefore, cannot know whether Owun would have spelt it with <ea> or <eo>.

<sup>109</sup> On the manuscript of the *Life of St Nicholas*, see below, IV.1. On the manuscript of Ch 1243 (Harm 121), see below, IV.1.3. Ch 1110 (Harm 62) is recorded in London, Public Record Office Charter Rolls, 8 Edward III, m. 13; Ch IWm (Farrer 89) is recorded in London, Public Record Office Charter Rolls, 4 Edward II, m. 20 (see Laing 1993: 115); Ch IWm (Galbraith 2) and (Galbraith 3) are recorded in the mid-thirteenth-century Winchester Cartulary (London, British Library, MS Add. 29436; see Laing 1993: 63).

Scandinavianized areas do also record the adjective with the latter meanings, albeit mainly during the late Middle English period. We could argue, though, that the negative connotations which the adjective had already in Old English facilitated its association with OE *gedeorf*. In non-Scandinavianized areas these associations may have been taken further than in the Scandinavianized areas, where the presence of the Norse cognate could have hindered the process.

Given the problematic evidence on which the Norse derivation of the adjective under consideration rests, it can only be presented as possible, while the adjective's native origin cannot be fully discounted (cp. Heidermanns 1993: 152–53 s.v. *derba*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*derbaz*).

(E) OE *dreng* 'lad, warrior; malefactor; in (post-Conquest?) Northumbria: member of a class of free tenants holding land by a form of tenure the nature of which was partly military and partly servile': This term is first attested in *The Battle of Maldon*, where it refers to one of the Scandinavian marauders. The term is generally analysed as a Norse-derived loan-word based on the Viking Age Norse noun attested in various runic inscriptions as **treks**, nom. sing. (Ög. 81; Brate 1911–18: 80–83), **triR**, nom. sing. (Ög. 104; Brate 1911–18: 104–05), etc. (cp. OIc *drengr* 'young, valiant man; young unmarried man; attendant'; see Björkman 1900–02: 208, Hofmann 1955: §288, de Vries 1961: s.v. *drengr*, Peters 1981: 96, Kisbye 1982a: 56–57, and Dance 2003: 348). Nothing in its form is suggestive of a Norse origin, though: Pokorny (Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. 2. *dher*, *dhera*) and de Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *drengr*) agree that OIc *drengr* may represent PIE *\*d<sup>h</sup>ereg<sup>h</sup>* 'to hold, hold fast' (> PGmc *\*ðranz-*) with a nasal infix, the root itself being regarded as a guttural extension of *\*d<sup>h</sup>er-* 'to hold'.<sup>110</sup> The Norse noun is either a *ja*-stem noun (< PGmc *\*ðranzjaz*; see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. 2. *dher-*, *dhera-*) or an *i*-stem noun (< PGmc *\*ðranziz*; see Noreen 1923: §389, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *drengr*). Thus, were the term native, we may have expected the velar to be palatalized, and, indeed, the MED (s.v. *dreng*, *dreng*) gives both a velar and a palatalized pronunciation as possibilities for this term. We cannot know how this word was pronounced in Old English as other terms which are assumed to have ended in [-ɲdʒ] in Old English are nowadays pronounced with [ŋ], which suggests a velar pronunciation for the initially palatalized consonant (e.g. OE *feng* 'feng', *streng* 'string', and *steng* 'pole'; see A. Campbell 1959: 428, Jordan 1974: §194, and Hogg 1992: §7.17.2). Since its phonological structure cannot be taken as a clear proof

<sup>110</sup> The meaning 'young man' may have derived from an initial meaning 'stick, pole, pillar' (cp. Aakjær 1927–28: 19, and Lindow 1976: 108).

of its Norse-derived character, and since the reasons for the use of the term in *Maldon* remain unclear (see Pons-Sanz 2008: 428–29), any claims in favour of this analysis have to rely on the lack of cognates in other Germanic languages (cp. Aakjær 1927–28: 15), the late record of the term in Old English, and the fact that its attestation as a term indicating social rank is in the main restricted to Scandinavianized areas (see the *MED*: s.v. *dreng*, senses 1.b and 2, Cormack 2000, and Syrett 2000: 246; cp. A. H. Smith 1970: s.v. *dreng*). Some of these attestations, however, albeit included in the *OEC*, are here associated with the Middle rather than with the Old English period (see below, IV.2.3.2.C).<sup>111</sup>

(F) OE *efne* ‘material’: As far as Old English is concerned, the term is only recorded in a late Northumbrian text, viz. the Aldredian glosses to the Durham Ritual, where it renders L *materiam* (cp. L *materia* ‘material, matter’; see below, I.24), but its attestations increase in the Middle English period and they are not clearly associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see the *MED*: s.v. *ēvene*, and Dance 2003: 350). It is commonly analysed as a Norse-derived term based on the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *efni* ‘stuff, material’ (< PGmc \**abnjan*; see Björkman 1900–02: 209, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *efne*, Serjeantson 1935: 68, the *MED*: s.v. *ēvene*, Hofmann 1955: §245, de Vries 1961: s.v. *efni*, Peters 1981: 96, the *DOE*: s.v. *efne*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *evene*, Dance 2003: 350, and Kries 2003: 386). However, Old English texts attest other terms associated with this word-field: e.g. OE *efnan* ‘to do, perform, engage in’, *afol* ‘power, might’ (see below, III.4.A), and *efen* in *andefen* ‘measure, quantity, amount’ and *landefen* ‘measure or proportion of land’ (see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. 1. *op*, and Orel 2003: s.vv. \**abnjan* and \**abnjanan*). Holthausen (Holthausen 1934: s.v. *efen*, f.) would consider the determinatum in these nominal compounds to be Norse-derived as well; however, the attestation of OE *andefen* already in HomS 14 (BlHom 4) 123 and Bo 32.72.26 and 38.123.20 argues in favour of de Vries’s (de Vries 1961: s.v. *efni*) and Orel’s (Orel 2003: s.vv. \**abnjan* and \**abnjanan*) presentation of the term as a cognate of OIc *efni*. It may therefore be the case that OE *efne* represents a native cognate of OIc *efni* as well. The formal similarity between OE *efne* and OIc *efni* and the fact that the first attestation of the term is associated with the Scandinavianized areas are the most important factors in favour of the foreign origin of the Old English noun.

<sup>111</sup> On the wider use of the term during the Middle English period, see Dance 2003. A hint of the increasing familiarity of the term may be recorded in its use as an equivalent of OE *drȳcge* (HomU 9 (ScraggVerc 4) 45) in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 41, an eleventh-century manuscript; however, <drencga> may represent an error rather than a conscious replacement of the native term (see Pons-Sanz 2008: 442 n. 126).

(G) OE *fæt* ‘vat, vessel, jar; clothes?’: This noun appears as the determinatum of the hapax legomenon ‘sadelfate’, attested in Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31). Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 193) suggests that, given the apparent inadequacy of the meanings for OE *fæt*, the term could be associated with its Norse cognate (cp. OIc *fat* ‘vessel; luggage, baggage; pl. clothes’); accordingly, she translates the compound as ‘trappings’ (for the two horses which are also part of the inheritance discussed in the will) (Whitelock 1930: 81). Her suggestion has been commonly accepted (see Hofmann 1955: §322, Peters 1981: 99, and Kisbye 1982b: 60). According to this interpretation, this compound would be equivalent to OE *sadolgearwe* (?) ‘trappings’, only recorded in Ch 1537 (Whitelock 27) 11 (*sadolgarum*).<sup>112</sup> However, it is important to bear in mind that OE *fæt* could also mean ‘closed vessel, receptacle, container, casket’ and, in the plural, ‘goods, possessions’ (see the *DOE*: s.v. *fæt* senses 2 and 1.c, respectively), and these meanings would not be inappropriate for the compound. The compound would then refer to containers placed on either side of the saddle or to the saddles themselves, respectively. Thus, it is rather the significant presence of Norse-derived vocabulary in the will (including non-technical terms; see below, 3.3.4) that can be taken as the strongest evidence in favour of interpreting the term as having adopted the suggested meaning from the Norse cognate.

(H) *farnian* ‘to prosper’: This verb, which is only recorded in Old English texts in the glosses to the Durham Ritual (see below, I.28), is commonly attributed a Norse origin (cp. OIc *farnask* ‘to speed well, be fortunate’; see Serjeantson 1935: 68, de Vries 1961: s.v. *farnask*, Peters 1981: 97, and Ross 1982: 197). Lack of breaking cannot be presented as evidence in favour of its Norse origin (see above, 2.2.1.8) because we would expect to see the effects of combinative breaking in this late Northumbrian text (cp. <farras> glossing L *tauri*, cp. L *taurus* ‘bull’, in MtGl (Li) 22.4 and DurRitGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 107.12; cf. WS *fearr*; see Hogg 1992: §5.29).<sup>113</sup> Thus, arguments in favour of the Norse origin of the term have to supplement the phonological evidence with the information provided by the dialectal distribution of the term, as well

<sup>112</sup> Given the late date of the document (see below, 2.4.2.L), it could be the case that the determinatum of this compound should be associated with ME *gere* ‘equipment, gear’ rather than OE *gearwe* ‘clothing, attire, gear’, in which case the term could be considered to be Norse-derived (cp. OIc *gervi* / *gørvi* ‘gear, apparel’; see Björkman 1900–02: 151 and 307, the *MED*: s.v. *gêre*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *gear*, n.; cf. de Vries 1961: s.v. *gervi*, *gørvi*, *gjørvi*). The *DOE* (s.v. *gearwe* noun<sup>1</sup>) seems to suggest, though, that the compound should be included in the OE *gearwe* word-field.

<sup>113</sup> Cp. OE (*ge*)*sparrian* (see below, III.1.5.E).



as the facts that the Aldredian glosses to the Durham Ritual also record other non-technical loan-words (see below, 4.3.1) and that there are no attested cognate verbs in the other Germanic languages.

(I) OE *fēolaga* ‘partner, associate; fellow, comrade’: This compound is commonly analysed as a Norse-derived loan-blend which mirrors a noun frequently attested in runic inscriptions as nom. sing. **filaki** (DR 318; Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 366–67), acc. sing. **felaga** (Vg. 182; Jungner and Svärdström 1940–71: 327–28), etc. (cp. OIc *fēlagi* ‘partner, shareholder; fellow, mate, comrade’). While the determinatum seems to have been adopted from the Norse term (although the same caveats as those associated with the OE *lagu* word-field apply here; see above 2.4.1.E), the determinant has been replaced by the Old English cognate of OIc *fē*, viz. OE *feoh* ‘cattle, property, money’ (see Björkman 1900–02: 209, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *fēo-laga*, Serjeantson 1935: 65, the *MED*: s.v. *fēlaue*, Hofmann 1955: §331, Peters 1981: 89, Kisbye 1982a: 59–60, the *DOE*: s.v. *fēo-laga*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *fellow*, n., and Dance 2003: 351). This replacement seems to suggest that Old English speakers were able to work out correspondences between their own terms and those of the Scandinavian newcomers (cp. OE *hrān* in the Old English Orosius; see above, 2.2.1.1). The common use of *-laga* in Old English texts to indicate either lying (cp. OE *ānlagā* ‘alone, solitary’, OE *lundlaga* ‘kidney’) or laying (cp. OE *ūtlaga* and related terms; see above, 2.4.1.E) and the presence of the native determinant must have facilitated the integration of the term into the Old English lexicon. Thus, OE *fēolagascipe*, which may be a native new formation instead of a Norse-derived loan-blend (cp. OIc *fēlagsskapr* ‘partnership, fellowship; friendship, companionship’), is attested not much later than OE *fēolaga* (see below, I.29). All the attestations of the terms in Old English texts are associated either with the Scandinavianized areas or with people of Scandinavian origin (see below, 3.4.2.2.E.2), which could be taken as the strongest evidence in favour of their Norse derivation.

(J) OE *feste* ‘pledge, security’: As pointed out above, 2.3.1.2.A, this noun is commonly identified as a Norse-derived loan-word and OWN *festr* and OEN *fest*, as well as OIc *fasta* ‘bail, pledge’, are brought into the picture to explain its origin (see Hofmann 1955: §214, and Peters 1981: 89). These Norse terms derive from the same Germanic root as OE *fasten* ‘stronghold, fortress, fast’, *fast* ‘fast, fixed’, and *fastan* ‘to fasten, make firm, ratify’ (i.e. PGmc *\*fast-*). Therefore, there is nothing in the form of OE *feste* or in the distribution of this word-field in the Germanic languages to suggest a foreign rather than a native derivation for the noun under analysis. However, given that the attestation of OE *feste* is limited to Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) (see below, I.30.1), where it appears in close connection



to OE *fēstermann*, it seems very clear that the two nouns should be associated. It could, of course, also be the case that OE *feste* is not a loan-word, but rather a native back-formation on the basis of *fēstermann* (see above, 2.3.1.2.A).

(K) OE *gēatan* ‘to grant; affirm, confirm, agree’: This verb is formed on the basis of the affirmative adverb OE *gēa* ‘yes’. However, all the attestations of the verb in Old English are restricted to the *Peterborough Chronicle* (mainly the Norse-influenced Interpolations and the First Continuation, which suggests that the attestation in ChronE (Irvine) 1087 is likely to be associated with the Peterborough phase in the transmission of the annals; cp. OE *ūtlaga* in ChronE (Irvine) 1071, see below, II.163.18). This, together with the fact that the verb is recorded during the Middle English period mainly in texts from the Scandinavianized areas (but also in texts from the South-West Midlands), could be taken as evidence in favour of the Norse derivation of the term. It may have been coined on the basis of the Viking Age Norse verb represented by OIc *játa* ‘to consent, grant’, and, possibly, in connection with its antonyms (cp. ME *nayten* ‘to deny’ and *nīten* ‘to deny’, cp. OIc *neita* and *níta* ‘to deny’ and OIc *nei* / *ní* ‘not’, cf. OE *nā*; see Kluge 1901: 933, Björkman 1900–02: 174, de Caluwé-Dor 1979: 684, the OED 1989: s.v. *yate*, v., the DOE: s.v. *gēatan*, and Dance 2003: 358).<sup>114</sup> It is important to bear in mind, though, that there is nothing in its form clearly pointing towards its Norse derivation. Orel (Orel 2003: s.v. *\*jētjanan*) suggests that the Norse term derives from PGmc *\*jētjanan*; *i*-umlaut would have been expected, but it is probably not present because of the analogical association of the verb with the adverb (see above, III.1.3.B; cp. Lidén 1886). The same could be said for the Old English verb, where gemination would not have taken place either because of the presence of a long vowel.<sup>115</sup> This, together with the existence of cognates in other West Germanic languages (e.g. OHG (*gi*)*já(ez)zen* ‘to assent’), has, however, led some scholars to identify the verb as native (see the MED: s.v. *yēten*, v.2, de Vries 1961: s.v. *játa*, and Björvand and Lindeman 2007: s.v. *jatte*).

(L) OE *goldwrecen* ‘inlaid with gold, made with gold’: This adjective is only recorded in Ch 1537 (Whitelock 27), a document associated with Scandinavianized Bury St Edmunds (see below, II.158). As noted by Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 185 n. to l. 7), whereas OIc *reka* (< *\*wreka*) is attested with

<sup>114</sup> On ME *nayten* and *nīten*, see Björkman 1900–02: 48 and 217, de Vries 1961: s.vv. *neita* and *níta*, the OED 2000–: s.vv. *nayt*, v.<sup>1</sup> and *nīte*, v., and Kries 2003: 94.

<sup>115</sup> On the alternation in the spelling of the root vowel between <ea>, <e>, and <æ>, see Hogg 1992: §§5.119–23, and Irvine 2004: cxxii–cxxiii.

the meaning ‘to beat iron, metal’ (see Fritzner 1972: s.v. *reka*, sense 5, and Cleasby and Vigfusson 1957: s.v. *reka*, sense V), this meaning is not otherwise attested for the Old English cognate (see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *wre-can*, sense I.d). Thus, Whitelock’s suggestion, echoed by Olszewska (Olszewska 1933: 78) and Peters (Peters 1981: 99), that this adjective is likely to be a Norse-derived loan-translation (cp. OIc *gullrekinn* ‘inlaid with gold’, cp. OIc *silfrefekinn* ‘inlaid with silver’) cannot be easily rejected.

(M) OE *hlēapan út*: Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §388; cp. Peters 1981: 92) argues that the meaning of ‘hlupon ut’ in the following context should be associated with the legal usage of OWN *hlaupa út*: ‘Her Eadwine eorl & Morkere eorl hlupon ut [*ut hlupon* in ChronE (Irvine) 1071], & mislice ferdon on wuda’ (ChronD (Cubbin) 1072.1 = ChronE (Irvine) 1071.1; ‘Here Earl Edwin and Earl Morcar ran off and travelled variously in woods’; see Swanton 2000: 206 s.a. 1072, and 207 s.a. 1071). *Hlaupa út* is commonly used in Norwegian laws with the meaning ‘to get out of the peace and protection granted by the social community one is immersed in and turn against its representative.’<sup>116</sup> As noted by Hofmann, OE *ūthlēapan* is only attested with the meaning ‘to escape’ (cp. LawIAtr 1.7 and 1.12 and LawHu 6; cp. OE *ūthlēap* ‘fine for a man escaping from his lord’). Following Kluge (Kluge 1901: 938), Hofmann identifies the form <hlupon> in the *Chronicle* as being itself Norse-derived (cp. OWN *hlupu* besides the more common *hljópu* as the 3<sup>rd</sup> pers. pl. pret. ind. of *hlaupa*, see Noreen 1923: §503, and OSwed. *lupu*, see Noreen 1904: §542.2; cf. OE *hlēopon*, see A. Campbell 1959: §745.b; cp. Kniezsa 1994: 240). This is of course a possibility, but the presence of <u> can be explained in other ways. On the one hand, <hlupon> may just be one of the forms of the verb exhibiting the influence of strong Class II verbs (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *lēpen*). On the other hand, given that the monophthongization of OE /e: o/ to /ø:/ is likely to have taken place by the time the exemplar from which the annals derive was written (see Hogg 1992: §§5.210–11, and Carroll 2010: 268–69 on the phonology, and Cubbin 1996: xlviii–liii, and Irvine 2004: lxiii on the sources for ChronD (Cubbin) 1072 and ChronE (Irvine) 1071), <u> may be an early manifestation of the Anglo-Norman spelling for the monophthongized reflex of the Old English diphthong (cp. <budende> for OE *bēodende* as a gloss for L *offerentes*, cp. L *offerens* ‘offering, presenting, showing’, in AldV 1 (Goossens) 820, and

<sup>116</sup> E.g. ‘Nu laupa þeir út. oc segia friði aptr. oc heria i hina somu vic, þa ero þeir niðingar’ (Gul. 314); ‘if they renounce the peace and sail forth to harry those same shores, they are nithings’, as translated by Larson 1935: 199.

<frunlice> for OE *frēondlice* ‘amicably’ in Ch 946 (Harm 107) 2, a spurious charter recorded in a twelfth-century manuscript; see further Schlemilch 1914: 38, and Jordan 1974: §84). Hofmann presents as further evidence in favour of the foreign origin of ‘hlupon’ the fact that Middle English texts record forms of the Norse-derived loan-word *lōpen* (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 70–71). However, it is noteworthy that the verb seems to have developed in English a weak past (*lopte*), rather than having maintained its strong form (see the *MED*: s.v. *lōpen*).

(N) OE *hundred* ‘hundred’: As far as our corpus is concerned, this noun is recorded in two texts closely associated with the Scandinavianized areas referring to ‘long hundreds (120) of silver ores’ (see below, I.50, and Whitelock 1979: 439 n. 6; see further Marburg 1856: 238–40).<sup>117</sup> Steenstrup (Steenstrup 1882: 173–74) pointed out that this reckoning is Norse-derived (cp. OIc *hundrað* ‘(duodecimal) hundred’), and this suggestion has been accepted by later scholars (see Hofmann 1955: §257 with references, Peters 1981: 96, and Neff 1989: 286).

(O) Given the similarities between the following two terms, they are analysed together:

(O.1) OE *manna blot* and *manslot* ‘share in ownership of land; measure of land?’ < OE *mann* + OE *blot* ‘part, portion; selection by lot, choice’:<sup>118</sup> Stenton (Stenton 1971: 514) suggests that the ‘share’ originally referred to may have been the portion of land which fell to one of the rank and file of the Danish army at the time of their settlement.<sup>119</sup> Accordingly, the compound is commonly associated with the Norse term represented by OIc *mannshlutr* ‘person’s

<sup>117</sup> A hundred seems to have equalled £8 in England, as suggested by Liebermann (Liebermann 1903–16: II. s.v. *hundred*) and Stenton (Stenton 1971: 510; see further Marburg 1856); cp. ch. 27.1 in *Leges Edwardi Confessoris*: the ora would have equalled sixteen pence, the mark, at this date both in England and Scandinavia, amounted to eight oras, and the hundred of silver had a hundred and twenty oras. On the Scandinavian duodecimal counting system, see Karker 1993.

<sup>118</sup> Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §208) argues that OE *blot* meant ‘lot, fate’ but not ‘share’. However, the term glosses L *portionem* (cp. L *portio* ‘portion, division’) in LkGl (Li) 15.12; the *OED* (*OED* 1989: s.v. *lot*, n.) illustrates with this context as well as with the references to *manna blot* in Ch 659 (Birch 1029) sense 2 for the noun: ‘What falls to a person by lot. a. That which is assigned by lot to a person as his share or portion in an inheritance, or in a distribution of property; a division or share of property made by lot’ (cp. OHG *lōz* ‘lot, fate; saying; share, allotment’; see Splett 1993: s.v. *liozan*). On the extension of this measure of land, see below, note 122 in this chapter.

<sup>119</sup> See also *ÆLS* (Auguries) 84–87 for a reference on the casting of lots for parcels of pasture land.

share' (see Napier 1905–06: 307–08, Hofmann 1955: §208, Peters 1981: 95, and Kisbye 1982a: 65–66).

(O.2) OE *plōgesland* 'what a yoke of oxen could plough in a season / year?, a plough-land' (approximately 120–60 acres): < OE *plōh* + OE *land*.<sup>120</sup> Even though the amount of land referred to by the compounds does not seem to coincide, the Old English term is commonly associated with the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *plōgsland* 'the area ploughed by a yoke of oxen in one day, an acre of land' (see the *MED*: s.v. *plōugh-lōnd*, Hofmann 1955: §216, Peters 1981: 96, Kisbye 1982a: 65, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *plough-land*, *plowland*).<sup>121</sup>

The most important factors which are presented as supporting the Norse origin of the terms are the following:

- (1) Their dialectal distribution: their use is restricted to the areas settled by the Scandinavian newcomers (see below, 3.3.4 and 3.3.6).<sup>122</sup>
- (2) Their morphology and agreement patterns: Stevenson argues that 'the composition of *plōgs-land* with the genitive singular is a proof of its Old Norse origin, the Old English dialects adhering to the older (Indo-Germanic) and more proper stem-composition' (W. H. Stevenson 1912: 22). This argument can, however, be counteracted by the fact that other similar compounds, which Carr (Carr 1939: 309–18) terms *secondary compounds* (e.g. OE *oxanhyrde* 'herdsman', and *dægeseage* 'daisy'), are attested in Old English and no foreign influence may necessarily be claimed for these terms (see further below, III.2.1.A). More interesting may be the fact that the presence of <s> instead of <es> in *manslot* could be taken as an indication of the maintenance of the Norse inflection (see above, 2.3.1.2.B). Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §216) emphasizes instead the fact that, in various cases when the compound appears with a numeral, the determinant seems to agree in number with the numeral, whereas the determinatum remains (seemingly) in the singular: e.g. 'iiii. plogaland' in Rec 24.1 (Rob

<sup>120</sup> On the etymology of OE *plōh*, see below, III.4.AAA.

<sup>121</sup> On the areas covered by these terms in Old English and Old Norse, see further W. H. Stevenson 1912: 21–22, S. Jansson 1968, with references, Kisbye 1982a: 65, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *plough-land*, *plow-land*.

<sup>122</sup> *Manslot* is also recorded in various documents associated with the manor of Walpole, Norfolk, where it appears as ME *tenmanlot*. Vinogradoff (Vinogradoff 1908: 280–81) explains that this unit contained a hundred and twenty acres, according to which one *manslot* would equal twelve acres (cp. Robertson 1939: 441 n. to l. 23).

84) 20 (cp. 'twega manna hlōt' in Ch 659 (Birch 1029) 26–27; cf. 'twa plogesland' in Rec 24.1 (Rob 84) 8 and 11–12, 'xxvii. manslōt' in Rec 5 (Rob 104) 10).<sup>123</sup> Hofmann suggests that this kind of agreement may belong to an early Norse or Anglo-Norse linguistic layer. However, this pattern could simply be attributed to the fact that the extant documents may record compounds in the making, according to which their agreement pattern has not been fully established yet. Thus, from a morphological perspective, nothing points clearly to a Norse rather than a native origin. The dialectal distribution of the terms seems then to be the strongest piece of evidence in favour of their foreign character.

(P) OE *sac* 'accused, charged, guilty': This adjective as a simplex is only recorded as far as the *OEC* is concerned in *III Æthelred*, which has commonly led to its identification as a Norse-derived term (cp. the masc. nom. sing. form **sakir** in Ög. N288, Gustavson 2003; cp. OIc *sekr* 'guilty, outlawed'; see Hofmann 1955: §§260 and 273, and Peters 1981: 90).<sup>124</sup> Given the presence of *i*-umlaut in the Norse term, we would have expected the root vowel to be /æ/. Noreen (Noreen 1923: §424 Anm. 2) notes the existence of OSwed. *saker*, which may exemplify the variation between umlauted and non-umlauted forms in *u*-stem adjectives (cp. the masc. forms Go. *hardus* 'hard', nom. sing., vs *hardjana*, acc. sing.). However, Noreen does not discard the possibility that the vowel of the Swedish adjective may be due to the influence of OSwed. *saker* 'legal dispute' (cp. OIc *sok*). Hofmann explains the presence of /a/ instead of /æ/ in the Old English term by relying as well on the influence of OE *sacu* 'conflict; persecution; sin, fault' (Hofmann 1955: §260). However, it is important not to forget the existence of OE *sæcc* 'strife, conflict, contest', with which the term could also have been associated. Given that nothing in the form of the adjective argues in favour of its being a Norse-derived loan-word instead of a native *u*-stem adjective which has adopted, like many others, the endings of an *a*-stem adjective (cp. de Vries 1961: s.v. *sekr*; see A. Campbell 1959: §655), any argument in favour of the former etymological explanation has to rely on the association of *III Æthelred* with the Anglo-Scandinavianized population (see below, II.13.1.5) and the fact that the other Germanic languages do not seem to have direct cognate adjectives (see Heidermanns 1993: 465). If OE *sac* is

<sup>123</sup> In the case of OE *land* we cannot know the number of the determinatum because it is a neuter noun with a long root syllable (see A. Campbell 1959: 570–73).

<sup>124</sup> On the Old Norse term and its use in Ög. N288 in particular, see also Breisch 1994: 163 and 170, and Brink 2002: 93–96.

then accepted as a Norse-derived term, OE *unsac* ‘innocent’ has to be analysed as either a Norse-derived loan-blend (cp. OIc *úsekr* ‘not guilty’; see Hofmann 1955: §273, and Peters 1981: 91) or a native new formation on the basis of the loan-word. Albeit ultimately related, OE *saclēas* ‘innocent’ should be discussed independently from these terms.

(Q) OE *saclēas* ‘innocent’: Even though during the eleventh century this adjective is attested in documents from various areas of the country, it is first recorded in the glosses to the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels and it next appears in *III Æthelred* (see further below, 3.4.2.2.C.1). Given its initial association with Anglo-Scandinavian areas, the adjective is commonly analysed as a Norse-derived loan-translation formed by OE *sacu* + OE *lēas* (cp. OIc *saklauss* ‘not guilty, innocent’; see Thorson 1936: 74, Hofmann 1955: §§238 and 260, de Vries 1961: s.v. *saklauss*, Peters 1981: 90, Kisbye 1982a: 60, Pons-Sanz 2000: 97–98, Pons-Sanz 2007b: 244, Townend 2002: 203, and Kries 2003: 328–29). The Norse derivation of the adjective may be supported by the fact that OE *sacful* ‘quarrelsome, contentious’, which we would expect to be the antonym of OE *saclēas*, is not recorded with the meaning ‘guilty, sinful’, and its Middle English reflex is first attested with that meaning in the *Cursor Mundi*, according to the *MED* (s.v. *sāckful*). However, the Norse derivation of the complex is not beyond doubt, for the term could have been formed by fully native means (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *sāklēsse*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *sackless*).

(R) OE ‘serð’: This imperative singular form renders L *moechaberis* (cp. L *moechari* ‘to commit adultery’) in the Lindisfarne glosses. No other form of the verb is attested in Old English, although there are records of later reflexes of the verb (see the *MED*: s.v. *serden*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *sard*). Given the tendency towards the alternation between <d> and <ð> in the Aldredian glosses (see below, III.1.8.C) and the attestation of various cases of early monophthongization after /s/ in Northumbrian texts (see Hogg 1992: §5.208), it is not possible to know whether the Old English verb was \**seorðan* (cp. Holthausen 1934: s.v. *seorðan*, the *MED*: s.v. *serden*, Clark Hall 1960: s.vv. *serð* and *seorðan*, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *serða*), \**serðan* (cp. Peters 1981: 98), \**seordan* (cp. the *OED* 1989: s.v. *sard*), or \**serdan*. Because of this uncertainty and the problems surrounding the etymology of OIc *serða* ‘to have intercourse with’ (see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. 4. *ser*, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *serða*), any arguments in favour of the Norse derivation of the verb (cp. Jordan 1907: 35–36, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *seorðan*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *serða*, Peters 1981: 98, and Pons-Sanz 2004) can only be very tentative, especially when we consider that the verb has well-attested cognates in other West Germanic languages (cp. OHG *sertan* ‘to have sexual intercourse with’, MLG *serden* id., and MDu. *seerden* id.). We cannot rely on



lack of breaking of /e/, which tends to be implemented with great regularity (see Hogg 1992: §5.22), or the presence of /θ/ instead of /d/ (see above, 2.2.2.3). Instead, it is only the attested dialectal distribution of the verb in Old English and later sources that can be taken as evidence in favour of its Norse derivation (see the *MED*: s.v. *serden*, where the verb is only associated with a text from the East Midlands, the *EDD*: s.v. *sard*, where the verb is given as a Nottinghamshire word, and Kries 2003: 137–38). This type of evidence, however, is not always considered to be strong enough for the inclusion of this verb in the list of Norse-derived terms in Old English (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *serden*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*serðanan*; the term is not discussed by Björkman 1900–02 or Hofmann 1955, and its Norse derivation is questioned by Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *seorðan*).

(S) OE *sōl* ‘sun’: This noun is only recorded in the Kirkdale sundial (North Riding of Yorkshire), where it is part of the compound ‘SOLMERCA’, and in PPs 120.6. Its presence in the latter context could hint at the native origin of the noun (cp. Holthausen 1934: s.v. *sōl*);<sup>125</sup> yet the possibility that it relies on L *sōl* ‘sun’ from the source cannot be discarded (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 255),<sup>126</sup> especially when we consider that *l*-forms referring to the sun seem to be otherwise restricted, as far as the Germanic languages are concerned, to Gothic (cp. Go. *sauil* < PGmc *\*sōwelō*) and Old Norse (cp. OIc *sól* < PGmc *\*sōwalō*; but cp. OE *sigel* ‘sun’ < PGmc *\*suzelan*, OE *swegl* ‘sky’ and *swegle* ‘bright, clear’ < PGmc *\*swezlaz*; cf. Go. *sunno* ‘sun’, OE / OFris. *sunne* id., OS / OHG *sunna* id.; see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *sāuzel-*, de Vries 1961: s.vv. *sól* and *sunna*, and Orel 2003: s.vv. *\*sōwelan* and *\*suzelan*). This leaves the etymology of OE *sōl* in the Kirkdale sundial unclear (see Elisabeth Okasha’s comments in L. Watts and others 1997: 81): it could represent an uncommon native term, another example of the Latin loan-word, or a Norse-derived loan-word. That OE *sōl*, if it ever existed, was very uncommon and that the inscription is located in a Scandinavianized area could be taken as factors in favour of the last option (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 255, Hofmann 1955: §326, Peters 1981: 98, and Kisbye

<sup>125</sup> Sisam and Sisam (Sisam and Sisam 1958: 17) hypothesize that the metrical version of the psalms, recorded in the *Paris Psalter* as well as, fragmentarily, in other texts (the oldest of which may be the *Menologium*), is likely to have been composed around the middle of the tenth century by a speaker of an Anglian dialect of Old English. Unfortunately, Toswell 1990 does not discuss the origin of the metrical version in any detail.

<sup>126</sup> ME *sol* could also be interpreted as a Romance loan-word (see the *MED*: s.v. *sol*, n.1), although the records of ME *sol* in texts from the areas under the linguistic influence of the Scandinavians could be associated with the Old English attestation of what seems to be a Norse loan.



1982b: 64). Yet the association of the inscription with an ecclesiastical context does not make its derivation from the Latin term impossible (cp. Wollmann 1996: 222).

The determinatum of the compound where OE *sōl* is recorded poses similar problems. It is not clear whether it should be analysed as a Norse-derived loan-word based on the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *merki* ‘mark, sign, token; boundary’, in which case the compound should be associated with OIc *sólmerki* ‘zodiac sign’ (cp. Townend 2002: 19), or whether it should be identified with OE *mearca* ‘space marked out’ (cp. OE *mearcian* ‘to mark, define’), according to which the compound would mean ‘sun-marker, sundial’, and would be associated with ‘symle he twelf siþum tida gemearcað dæges ond nihtes’ (Phoen 146) (‘always, twelve times, he marks the hours by day and night’). Given the semantic difference between the Norse compound and the compound on the inscription and the possible association of the latter with the sentence in the *Phoenix*, it may be best to agree with Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §326) that this is a native new formation with a Norse-derived determinant and a native determinatum.

(T) OE ‘song’ ‘bed’: As far as Old English is concerned, this term is only attested in the Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels (see below, I.82). It is commonly considered to be Norse-derived (cp. Holthausen 1934: s.v. *song*, Serjeantson 1935: 68–69, Hofmann 1955: §241, Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *song*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *seng*, *sæing*, Peters 1981: 98, Ross 1982: 197, Pons-Sanz 2000: 98–99, and Pons-Sanz 2004), but its phonological form poses some problems because the Norse term with which it is associated tends to have palatal vowels in its root (cp. OIc *sæng*, *sæing* ‘bed’, OEN *sæng*, *sieng*, *siang* id.). Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §241) accounts for the vowel in the Old English term by suggesting that its etymon would have been OEN *siǣng*; the diphthong would have become rising (cp. Brøndum-Nielsen 1935: §469.24, and Brøndum-Nielsen 1950: §147 Anm. 3, who suggests the following evolution: *\*sǣiang* > *\*sǣang* > *siǣng*), and, given that the sound combination /sj/ is not common in Old English, the term would have been reinterpreted as *\*sǣng* ‘song’, representing the nasalization of /a(:)/ (cp. Hogg 1992: §§ 5.3–5). The etymology of the Norse term remains unclear, though (see Falk and Torp 1910–11: s.v. *seng*, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *seng*, *sæing*). Thus, the dialectal distribution of the term in English texts (see A. Wall 1898: 116, the *EDD*: s.v. *saeng*, and Thorson 1936: 74) and the lack of attestation of any direct cognates in other West Germanic languages have to be taken as the main evidence in favour of the Norse origin of the noun.

(U) OE *sticca* ‘stick’: This noun appears in Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) as a reference to a land measure equivalent to half an acre. Given that this seems to be

the only attestation of the term with this meaning,<sup>127</sup> it is possibly the case that, as suggested by Robertson (Robertson 1939: 331 n. to l. 21) and Kelly (Kelly 2009: 337 and 344), the term should be interpreted as a Norse-derived semantic loan (cp. OIc *stika* ‘stick; yard, yard measure equal to two Icelandic ells’). We should remember, though, that this is by no means the only Old English term referring to both a ‘stick’ and a land measure (cp. OE *gyrd* ‘rod, staff; virgate’; see *DOE*: s.v. *gyrd*). Thus, it may be the case that the polysemy of OE *sticca* developed by fully native means (it is modified by OE *landes* ‘of land’, that being the same collocational structure of OE *gyrd*), or that precisely the existence of similar examples in Old English facilitated the development of the semantic loan. Thus, the dialectal distribution and the rarity of the term with the technical meaning under consideration are the main reasons to consider that it may be Norse-derived.<sup>128</sup>

(V) OE *ðrefe* ‘a measure of corn or fodder, thrave’ (see Zupko 1968: s.v. *thrave*): Its phonological form cannot be fully trusted as evidence of its Norse-derived character. De Vries (de Vries 1961: s.vv. *þrefi* and *þrifa*) explains that the etymology of the Old Norse term and others related to it is uncertain, while Jóhannesson (Jóhannesson 1956: s.v. *treip*-) would associate these terms with PIE *\*treip*- (presumably, *\*trep*- in the case of the noun under consideration). Thus, OE *ðrefe* could easily be a native reflex of this root. Instead, given that, as far as the *OEC* is concerned, this term is only attested in a tenth-century document associated with Scandinavianized Peterborough (viz. Ch 1448 (Rob 39); see below, I.92), its dialectal distribution (both during the Old English period and afterwards; see the *EDD*: s.v. *thrave*, sb. and v.<sup>1</sup>, the *MED*: s.v. *thrēve*, n., and Kries 2003: 290–91) and the lack of attestation of related nouns in other Germanic languages (except for NFrís. *traav*, which is likely to be Norse-derived; see the *OED* 1989: s.v. *thrave*, *threave*) are probably the best indicators of its Norse origin (cp. OIc *þrefi* ‘a number of sheaves, thrave’; see Björkman 1900–02: 223, Thorson 1936: 83–84, Peters 1981: 96, and Kries 2003: 291). Björkman (Björkman 1901: 6, and Björkman 1900–02: 223) suggests that, while the Middle English form with <e> is likely to derive from Old West Norse, the by-form with <a> is likely to go back to Old East Norse (cp.

<sup>127</sup> The term seems to have been homonymous with a noun referring to a measure of eels (see Rec 9.1 (RobApp II 9) 69; see further Robertson 1939: 505 n. to l. 16, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *stick*, n.<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>128</sup> It is not recorded with a similar meaning until the seventeenth century, a usage which may be a later semantic development triggered by an analogical relationship with *staff* (see the *OED* 1989: s.v. *stick*, n.<sup>1</sup>, sense 13).

MSwed. *þrave*, MnSwed. *trafve*, MnDa. *trave*; see the *OED* 1989: s.v. *thrave*, *threave*). Although this distinction may also apply as far as the Old English term is concerned, we have to bear in mind that the presence of /a/ may be secondary (cp. Falk and Torp 1910–11: s.v. *trave*, Jóhannesson 1956: s.v. *treip*-, and de Vries 1961: *þrefi*) and that the possibility that by-forms with /e/ were also used in Old East Norse cannot be ruled out. It may, of course, also be the case that <e> should not be fully trusted as evidence of the presence of this vowel in Old English (cp. <waterfet> in Ch 1448 (Rob 39) 6, where the determinatum represents OE *fæt* ‘vessel’).

(W) OE *ðrinna* ‘three times’: The common term to express ‘three times’ in Old English was the adverb *ðriwa*; thus, OE *ðrinna*, which is only attested in the Scandinavian-orientated *III Æthelred* as far as the *OEC* is concerned (see below, I.93), is commonly derived from the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *þrinnr* / *þrennr* ‘triple’ (< PGmc *\*þriznaz* < PIE *\*trisno*-; see Björkman 1900–02: 173, the *MED*: s.v. *thrin*, Hofmann 1955: §265, de Vries 1961: s.v. *þrinnr*, K. Brunner 1965: §329 Anm. 2, Peters 1981: 98, Kisbye 1982b: 60, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *thrin*, *thrinne*, and Dance 2003: 290). The Viking Age Norse form would have been expected to have a plural ending; it is commonly suggested that the ending in the Old English term has been taken over from OE *ðriwa*. Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 173) would like to see the presence of OE /nn/ < PGmc *\*/zn/* as indicative of its Norse origin, for this sound change is well attested in Old Norse while the Old English data are somewhat problematic (see Noreen 1913: §73, and Noreen 1923: §224.2; cp. OIc *rann* ‘house’ < PGmc *\*raznan*, on which see de Vries 1961: s.v. *rann*). However, Hogg (Hogg 1992: §4.16) puts forward some examples (viz. OE *\*rænn* and *\*hrænn*, cp. OE *ærn* ‘house’ and *hærn* ‘wave’) which suggest that this combination of consonants could have followed in Old English the same path as in Old Norse (cp. G. Britton 1957: §165, and Ross and Berns 1992: 645–46). Given that its phonological structure cannot be seen as fully reliable evidence in favour of its foreign origin, any suggestion in this respect has to be based on the following facts:

(W.1) Old Norse seems to be the only Germanic language with a reflex of PIE *\*trisno*- (cp. L *terni* ‘group of three, triad’ / *trini* ‘three in a group, triple’; see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *trei*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *þrennr*, *þreðr*, *þrinnr*, R. Coleman 1992: 420, Ross and Berns 1992: 646–47, and Meiser 1998: §118.5). Holthausen (Holthausen 1934: s.v. *ðrinna*), however, associates the adverb with OE *ðrinen* ‘threefold’, a Canterbury term which renders members of the L *trinus* ‘three (each)’ word-field (see Milfull 1996: 89–90, with references), and OE *ðrinlic* ‘threefold’ (cp. OFris. *thrîna* ‘triple’). *Drin*- in these terms may represent the same Proto-Indo-European root as the Norse term, but it is more

likely to be the reflex of the by-form PIE *\*trikno-* (see Orel 2003: s.v. *prixnaz*, with references). Alternatively, OE *ðrinn-* could have been formed by fully native means by analogy with the word-field represented by OE *twiga* / *twiwa* ‘twice’ and *getwinn* ‘twin’ (on which see below, III.4.RRR).

(W.2) The term is attested during both the Old English and the Middle English periods in texts which, generally speaking, are associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see below, 3.3.3).

## 2.5. Other Sources of Evidence

There are many cases where Norse derivation cannot be suggested because of the phonological or morphological structure of a term, nor because of any clear association with the Scandinavian newcomers or the areas where they settled. It is therefore simply the late attestation of a term and, in some cases, the fact that no cognates are attested in other (West) Germanic languages that can be brought forward in favour of their foreign character. This is the situation regarding the following terms.

(A) OE *bōnda* ‘free peasant, husbandman; head of a household, husband’: The term is commonly analysed as a loan-word based on the Viking Age Norse noun represented by nom. sing. **bunti** in Ög. 94 (Brate 1911–18: 93–95) and **buonti** in Vs. 24 (S. B. F. Jansson 1964: 69–76; cp. OIc *bóndi* / *bóandi* / *búandi* ‘husbandman, farmer; head of a household, husband’; see Björkman 1900–02: 205, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *bōnda*, Serjeantson 1935: 64, Hofmann 1955: §§313, 354, the *MED*: s.v. *bōnde*, n.1, de Vries 1961: s.v. *bóndi*, Peters 1981: 93, Kisbye 1982a: 57 and 59, the *DOE*: s.v. *bōnda*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *bond*, n.2 and adj., and Dance 2003: 342). The Norse term was originally a present participle (cp. OIc *búa* ‘to live, dwell, have a household’) and, accordingly, it is the Norse equivalent of OE *būend* ‘dweller, inhabitant’ (cp. OE *būan* ‘to stay, dwell; inhabit, cultivate’). Noreen (Noreen 1904: §180.4, and Noreen 1923: §130) suggests that the Norse contracted form goes back to *\*bōund*, *und* being a by-form of the present participle suffix *and* (cp. acc. sing. **bounta** in Öl. 19 vs **bunta** in Öl. 36 and **bonta** in Öl. 37, Ög. 29, etc., Söderberg and Brate 1900–06: 69–70, 99–100, and 101–02, and Brate 1911–18: 27–28, respectively; see Noreen 1904: §440). He also explains that examples of contracted forms can already be found in the earliest skaldic poems. It is, however, not clear whether the etymon of the Old English term had already undergone contraction. Hogg (Hogg 1992: §§143–44) explains that, while there is great variation in Anglian dialects, in West Saxon the hiatus formed by two back vowels (except for /u:a/) tends to be resolved with the loss of the unstressed vowel;

thus, /o:a/ could have been adopted as /o:/ following native patterns. /u:a/ tends to remain even in West Saxon, which may suggest that this was not the predominant form of the etymon encountered by the Old English speakers. The loan-word is occasionally recorded as ‘bunda’ (LawVIIaAtr 3, and ChronE (Irvine) 1048.24), which may indicate that the term was associated with the native *būan* (cp. Björkman 1901: 5 n. 1) or that, through folk etymology, it was already being associated with the past participle of OE *bindan* ‘to bind, tie, restrain’, viz. *bunden*. The latter would have facilitated the process of semantic pejoration undergone by the term in Middle English (see the *MED*: s.v. *bōnde*, n.1, senses 3 and 4; cp. Steenstrup 1882: 100, and Vinogradoff 1908: 420).

The noun has also been adopted as part of the compound OE *hūsbōnda* ‘householder, master of a house’, a loan-word or loan-blend based on the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *húsbóndi* ‘master of the house’ (see Björkman 1900–02: 214, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *hús* (~*bōnda*), Serjeantson 1935: 64–65, the *MED*: s.v. *hōus-bōnde*, Hofmann 1955: §271, de Vries 1961: s.v. *hús*, Kisbye 1982a: 59, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *husband*, and Dance 2003: 361). Lexical productivity in the word-field is further represented by the compound OE *bōndeland* ‘land held as a tenancy by a free peasant farmer’, only attested in the *OEC* in an interpolation in the E-text of the *Chronicle* (see below, I.7.2).<sup>129</sup>

(B) OE *cnīf* ‘knife; perhaps small knife, penknife’: The simplex is only attested as far as the *OEC* is concerned in two late Old English texts (see below, I.13). Because of its late attestation and the common use of the Norse term in Scandinavian sources, it is commonly attributed a Norse-derived character (cp. OIc *knífr* ‘knife, dirk’; cp. Holthausen 1934: s.v. *cnīf*, Serjeantson 1935: 69, the *MED*: s.v. *knīf*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *knífr*, Peters 1981: 94, Kisbye 1982a: 50, the *DOE*: s.v. *cnīf*, and Dance 2003: 345). However, the Norse origin of the term is not always accepted. Björkman presents it amongst the ‘words which may be looked upon as possibly borrowed from Scandinavian’ (Björkman 1900–02: 247, 226), but explains that the existence of cognates in other West Germanic languages (e.g. OFris. *knīf* ‘knife, poniard’, MDu. *cnijf* id., MLG *knīf* id.; cp. PGmc *\*knībaz*) makes the possibility that the noun is a native derivation quite likely; in fact, Kisbye (Kisbye 1982a: 50) mentions that some people

<sup>129</sup> Scholars have for a long time claimed the existence of the feminine noun OE *hūsbōnde* ‘mistress of the house’, supposedly an English new formation on the basis of OE *hūsbōnda*; it is said to be recorded only once as ‘husbondum’ in Exod 3.22 (see, for instance, Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *hūs-bonde*, and Serjeantson 1935: 65). However, Kornexl has convincingly dismissed the existence of this noun, and has instead associated the aforementioned form with OE *hūsbōnda* (Kornexl 2006).

have derived the Norse term from Old Frisian (he does not give any further references).<sup>130</sup> Similarly, Pokorny (Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *gen-*), the *OED* (*OED* 1989: s.v. *knife*, n.), and Orel (Orel 2003: s.v. *knībaz*) interpret it as a native term. Given the lack of very strong evidence in favour of its Norse derivation, the term is included in the main body of this study because of scholarly tradition. The possibility that it is not Norse-derived cannot be discounted, though.

(C) OE *cost* ‘way, manner, source of action’: This term is commonly analysed as a Norse-derived loan-word which has its etymon in the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *kostr* ‘choice, condition, means’ (see Björkman 1900–02: 247, Hofmann 1955: §§245 and 264, de Vries 1961: s.v. *kostr*, Peters 1981: 89, Ross 1982: 197, the *DOE*: s.v. *cost* noun<sup>2</sup>, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *cost*, n.1, and Dance 2003: 346). It is noteworthy, however, that Old English texts record not only a verb which is etymologically related to this noun (viz. OE *costian* ‘to tempt, try, prove, examine’; cp. OE *cēosan* ‘to choose, test’ < PGmc *\*keusanan*, an ablaut variant), but also a cognate noun (viz. OE *cyst* ‘free will, choice, election’ < PGmc *\*kustiz*; cp. OFris. *kest* ‘choice, statute’). Orel (Orel 2003: s.vv. *\*kustiz* and *\*kustuz*) suggests that there existed forms belonging to two different stem classes. Besides the terms seemingly representing an *i*-stem, there are some terms which appear to represent instead a *u*-stem (e.g. Go. *kustus* ‘test, trial’; cp. L *gustus* ‘tasting’; cp. Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *geus-*). Orel includes OIc *kostr* under both by-forms and explains that the term shows traces of having represented a *u*-stem. If we hypothesize an Old English *u*-stem noun, we could easily explain OE *cost* as a result of the fact that the term would have been associated with *a*-stem nouns early enough for the root vowel to undergo vowel harmony (see A. Campbell 1959: §613, and Hogg 1992: §3.10). The earliest attestations of the term cannot be taken either as clear indicators of its foreign origin: while it is first attested in the Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Durham Ritual, we later on find it in two documents from Æthelred’s reign which are more or less contemporary, viz. *III Æthelred* and Ch 939 (Whitelock 16.2), where Æthelred confirms Æthelric’s bequest of some lands to Christ Church, Canterbury (see below, I.15). Even though Æthelric lived in the Scandinavianized areas of East Anglia, and was suspected of having allied himself with Svein against Æthelred, there is nothing to suggest that the drafters of the document had the same connections. OE *cost* is used immediately before the text indicates that ‘þeos swutelung wæs þærrihte gewriten 7 beforan þam cincge and þam witon gerædd’ (‘this declaration was straightway written and

<sup>130</sup> For an argument in favour of interpreting both OIc *knifr* and OE *cnīf* as Basque loan-words borrowed via Old French (cp. OFr. *cnivet*, *canivet* ‘knife’), see Vennemann 1997.



read before the king and the council'), and Keynes (Keynes 1980: 129–30) uses this document as evidence for the existence of a chancery allowing for the production of written documents at a royal meeting (cp. Whitelock 1930: 149). Thus, while *III Æthelred* is clearly associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see below, II.13.1.5), Ch 939 (Whitelock 16.2) is not, and the chronology of the text does not allow us to explain the presence of OE *cost* here as a result of an increasing use of the term in the legal technolæct possibly facilitated by its presence in *III Æthelred*. These problems may lie behind the attribution of a native origin to this term by some authorities (see Holthausen 1934: s.v. *cost* 1, and the *MED*: s.v. *cost*, n.1). However, given that there is a high degree of consensus amongst scholars regarding the foreign origin of the term and that there is no clear evidence against such etymological interpretation, OE *cost* is included in the main body of this study.

(D) OE *gecrōcod* 'crooked, bent': This term is only recorded, as far as the *OEC* is concerned, in the *Life of St Giles* (see below, I.17). Given its late attestation, Dance (Dance 2003: 417, and Dance forthcoming b) has recently argued that it cannot be taken as unambiguously native, but should rather be associated with ME *crōken*, which should in its turn be analysed as a denominal verb (cp. ME *crōk* 'hook', a term commonly derived from the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *krókr* 'hook, barb, peg'; see Björkman 1900–02: 248, Serjeantson 1935: 71, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *ge-crōcod*, Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. 3. *ger-*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *krókr*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *crook*, n. and adj.). Dance's view is not uncommon amongst scholars (see Serjeantson 1935: 71, and Peters 1981: 87), although it is not universally accepted (see the *MED*: s.vv. *crōk*, *crōked*, and the *DOE*: s.v. *ge-crōcod*).<sup>131</sup> The disagreement is probably due to the fact that the main reason to suggest the Norse origin of the term, other than its late attestation, seems to be the lack of direct cognates in other Germanic languages; there may, however, be ablaut variants (cp. OE *crycc* 'crutch', OS *krukka* id., OHG *krucka* id., and OHG *krācho* 'hook'; cp. Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. 3. *ger-*, and Jóhannesson 1956: s.v. 3. *ger-*, but cf. *OED* 1989: s.v. *crook*, n. and adj., where we are told that the connection between these terms is far from clear).<sup>132</sup>

(E) OE *cwenfugol* 'hen-bird, female bird': This compound is only attested in the so-called Old English *Prose Phoenix* (see below, I.18), where it appears

<sup>131</sup> A native origin for the adjective under consideration would indeed be supported if OE *Crochyresta* (Crockhurst, Sussex), recorded in the tenth-century document Ch 525 (Birch 834), could be said to have OE *\*crōc* as its initial element (see A. H. Smith 1970: s.v. *\*crōc*).

<sup>132</sup> I am very thankful to Dr Richard Dance for having allowed me to have access to his discussion of this term, which is due to appear in Dance forthcoming b.



together with OE *carlfugol* (on which see above, 2.2.1.8.B.2). This should be associated with the fact that the compound represents a type which was not common in Old English. It can only be compared with OE *cwenhirde*, which glosses L *eunuchus* ‘eunuch’ in MtGl (Li) 19.12, but this comparison is not beyond doubt. It may be the case that the determinant of the latter compound is actually OE *cwēn* ‘queen’, as suggested by Clark Hall (Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *cwēnhirde*; cf. the *DOE*: s.v. *cwen-hyrde*). As I have pointed out somewhere else (Pons-Sanz 2007e: 145–46), the written records suggest that, when Old English speakers did not use a different term to differentiate gender (e.g. OE *bicce* ‘bitch’ vs OE *hund* ‘dog’, OE *wylf* ‘she-wolf’ vs OE *wulf* ‘(he-)wolf’),<sup>133</sup> they preferred OE *wif* ‘woman, female’ (and its Middle English reflex) over OE *cwene* to refer to a female being (see the list of compounds with OE / ME *wif* as the determinant in Clark Hall 1960, Sauer 1985: 489 and 512, the *MED*: s.v. *wif*, n.2, sense 3, and Fell 2002: 202). This suggests that the compound, like its companion, is likely to be Norse-derived (cp. Carr 1939: 28, Grinda 1966: 413, Yerkes 1984: 26–27, and the *DOE*: s.v. *cwen-fugel*).

(F) OE *cwyddian* ‘to talk, say, discuss’ and OE *crafian* ‘to crave, ask, implore, demand’: These verbs are recorded together in the given order on four occasions: once as simplexes and three times as derivatives with the prefix *un-* (see below, 3.4.2.2.C.1, I.16, and I.19).<sup>134</sup> In those contexts, the simplexes seem to mean ‘to accuse, make a claim against’ and ‘to summon’, respectively. These meanings are generally suggested to be Norse-derived semantic loans (cp. OIc *kveðja* ‘to call on, summon’ and OIc *krefja* ‘to crave, demand, claim’; see, for instance, Hofmann 1955: §§261–62 and 312, and Peters 1981: 92 and 107).<sup>135</sup> OE *crafian* is only attested in late Old English texts (see the *DOE*: s.v.

<sup>133</sup> The use of pronouns to create compounds indicative of gender did not develop until the Middle English period (see the *MED*: s.v. *hē*, pron. 1, and *hē*, pron. 2).

<sup>134</sup> The *DOE* suggests that *crafian* may also mean ‘to summon’ in Rec 10.6.2 (Dickins-Earle) 8.1 (on which see below, II.247), where it appears on its own (‘Huberd on Clist cræfeded anne wifman þe Edit hatte Liuegeres wif mid unrihte for þam Liueger hig alisde ut at Gosfreige bisceope’) (*DOE*: s.v. *crafian*, sense 2). However, there is no reason why the verb in this legal document could not be translated as ‘to demand, claim (as a slave)’, as suggested by Förster (Förster 1933b: 48 no. 12). Thus, the aforementioned passage could be translated as ‘Hubert of Clist had claimed [as a slave] one woman Edith, the wife of Liofgar, without justification because Liofgar had redeemed her from Bishop Geoffrey’. The claimant’s action is referred to as ‘unriht cræfinge’ (Rec 10.6.2 (Dickins-Earle) 8.6–7), and OE *crafing* only seems to mean ‘legal demand, claim’ (see the *DOE*: s.v. *crafing*).

<sup>135</sup> Surprisingly, Neff does not mention them in her survey of the Norse-derived vocabulary in III *Æthelred* (Neff 1989).

*craflan*) and has sometimes been identified as a possible Norse-derived loan-word (see Steenstrup 1882: 184, Björkman 1900–02: 248, and Hofmann 1955: §§261–62). However, both Björkman and Hofmann express their concern about the presence of <a> instead of the expected <e> or <æ> (cp. VAN \**kræflan*; see Wollmann 1996: §5.4).<sup>136</sup> Due to this phonetic difficulty, the lack of strong evidence in favour of the Norse origin of the term, and the fact that ‘forcrafað’ renders *L exegetit* (cp. *L exigere* ‘to demand, require’) in BenR 48.82.3,<sup>137</sup> it is here considered only as a semantic loan (cp. Peters 1981: 107). Given the common combination of *krefja* and *kveðja* in Scandinavian sources, it may be the case that the whole phrase was Norse-derived (cp. Hofmann 1955: §261, with references, and Kisbye 1982b: 60–61).

(G) OE *drincelēan*: This compound, which is only recorded in LawIICn 81 (‘And drincelean 7 hlafordes rihtgifu stande æfre unawend’; ‘and *drincelēan* and the lord’s rightful gift should always remain undisputed’; = LawNorthu 67.1; see below, I.23), is commonly interpreted as a loan-translation based on the Viking Age Norse term represented by OWN *drekkulaun* ‘reward for drink’ (i.e. a gift presented by the king to one who has entertained him, as in Gul. 270; see Larson 1935: 418). The meaning of the Old English compound is not clear, though. Steenstrup (Steenstrup 1882: 186–87) argues in favour of assigning it the same meaning as the Norse term. Kastovsky (Kastovsky 1992: 334), following Peters (Peters 1981: 91), and Townend (Townend 2002: 203) translate it with a more general sense: ‘entertainment given by a lord to his tenants’. Bosworth and Toller (Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *drynce-leán*), Robertson (Robertson 1925: 359 n. to LawIICn 81), and Clark Hall (Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *dryncelēan*) prefer to associate this word with the gift of drink-money which may have marked the successful conclusion of a bargain.<sup>138</sup> Similarly, the *TOE* includes this compound under 15.05 (‘trade, traffic, commerce’) and translates it as ‘drink confirming sale’. Liebermann (Liebermann 1903–16: I, 366), Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §314), and Whitelock (Whitelock 1979: 467 n. 2) provide both Steenstrup’s and the commercial translation without favouring either. I have analysed the meaning of this term in more detail elsewhere (Pons-Sanz 2007b: 63–65); only a summary is provided here. The commercial meaning for this term is indeed appropriate if the Cnutian decree is taken in associa-

<sup>136</sup> See Noreen 1923: §63.1 on the reflexes of *i*-umlauted PGmc \*/a/ in Old Norse (cp. PGmc \**kraffanan*; see Orel 2003: s.v. \**kraffanan*).

<sup>137</sup> The manuscript actually reads <giforcrafað>; this is probably a form with haplography where ‘gif’ represents *L si* ‘if’ in the exemplar.

<sup>138</sup> See also Vinogradoff 1906–07: 538 and the *MED*: s.v. *beverage*, sense b.

tion with its source, LawIIIATR 3 (see Wormald 1999: Table 5.4, and Pons-Sanz 2007b: 159–63); thus, the semantic difference between the Old English and the Old Norse terms and the fact that the OE *lēan* ‘reward, gift’ word-field has other well-attested compounds may argue in favour of the native origin of the compound. However, the meaning of the Norse term is also highly appropriate for LawIICn 81, especially when the decree is analysed together with LawIICn 79 and 80, which refer to issues of land tenure and use. When this is associated with the late attestation of the term and its formal similarity with the Norse compound, the analysis of this noun as Norse-derived, albeit not beyond doubt, cannot be easily rejected.

(H) OE *frið* ‘peace, tranquillity, security, refuge’: The term appears in LawIICn 13 in the following context: ‘& se ðe utlages weorc gewyrce, wealde se cingc þæs friþes’. Robertson translates the decree as ‘if anyone does the deed of an outlaw, the king alone shall have the power to grant him security’ (Robertson 1925: 181). Similarly, Hurnard, while trying to establish the royal monopoly of pleas as it stands in *II Cnut*, expresses her belief that ‘this seems to mean that only the king can give him protection pending his trial, if he is ready to stand his trial, and this certainly suggests that the trial itself will also be the king’s concern’ (Hurnard 1949: 293). It seems more likely that the decree refers to the trial itself, i.e. that we are told that it is only up to the king to decide on the individual’s capacity to retain his/her right to peace and protection.<sup>139</sup> He shall decide whether the criminal becomes *friðlēas* ‘outlawed’ (cp. LawIICn 15a; see below) or, as the Scandinavian legal codes put it (e.g. Gul. 35, and Jn. 24), remains *friðheilagr* ‘inviolable, protected by the law’. That this is the case is suggested by a Latin version of the code in the *Quadripartitus*: ‘eius revocatio sit in miseridordia regis (paci emendatio in solius regis consistat imperio)’ (Liebermann 1903–16: I, 317) (‘his reinstatement [into society] rests on the king’s mercy (the restoration of his [right to] peace rests in the office of the king)’).<sup>140</sup> ‘Right to peace or protection granted by the legal society where one

<sup>139</sup> Cp. the *DOE* (s.v. *friþ*, sense 4.1.i.b), where the suggested meaning for OE *frið* in this context is ‘protection granted by the king to an outlaw, ? pardon’. The following information relies on Pons-Sanz 2007b: 129–32.

<sup>140</sup> Cp. LawICn 2.2, where the king is said to be the only one who can pardon the life of a person who has broken ‘fully’ the *grīð* offered by either a church or the king’s hand; and ChronE (Irvine) 1052.62–65, where King Edward revokes the sentence of outlawry on Earl Godwine, his children and his men (see ChronD (Cubbin) 1051.1.48–50, where the king declares one of Earl Godwine’s sons ‘utlage’). On the relationship between the E-text and *Cnut*’s decree, see also Lundgren 1996: 21–23.

is immersed' is one of the meanings of OWN *fridr*, as exemplified in the expression OWN *fyrirgøra fé ok friði* 'to forsake all rights to property and peace' (e.g. Gul. 32, Frost. V.45). This personal peace was integrated into a more general sphere, according to which OWN *fridr* was enjoyed by the whole society, as suggested in the phrase OWN *til árs ok friðar* (e.g. Frost. II.32), where fertility (*ár*) is associated with peace (*fridr*). No other Old English text uses OE *frid* to indicate whether the individual will be able to remain in the legal society and retain its benefits or not, while the individual's right to protection and peace is commonly expressed by a member of the OE *mund* word-field (see below, 3.4.2.2.D). To find good *comparanda* we have to turn to Scandinavian laws, such as SkL 90, where it is said that, if a man kills another once compensation for a previous crime has been paid, he shall 'faræ friþlōs ok fa aldrigh friþ' ('go away as an outlaw, and never regain the right to protection'). Similarly, VmL Ku. 6 explains that he who breaks the king's *edsöre* 'oath-confirmed' legislation (i.e. the legislation produced following the oath by the king, along with other important men of the realm, to protect public security) has forsaken everything he owns, shall be made an outlaw and 'alder i frið coma' ('shall never come back to the protection offered by the legal society').<sup>141</sup> However, if the person (or his heir) against whom he has committed the crime pleads in his favour, then 'a conongær hanom friþ giwa oc han löse sic i friþ wiþ conong mæþ fioratighe marcom' ('the king has to give him back his right to protection, and he shall redeem himself in peace with the king with forty marks').<sup>142</sup> Thus, OE *frid* in LawIICn 13 could be interpreted as a semantic loan from its Old Norse cognate. The new meaning is mirrored by the uncommon syntactic construction because the demonstrative is only seldom used with OE *frid*. In those cases where it is, OE *frid* receives some postmodification: e.g. 'Eac ic ðancie Gode 7 eow callum ðe me fylston, ðæs friðes ðe nu habbað æt ðam ðyfðam' (LawIIEm 5) ('I also thank God and all of you, who have supported me, for the immunity from thefts which we now have').

OE *frid* has the same meaning in the compound OE *fridlēas* 'outlawed' (LawIICn 15a), where it refers, not to lack of general protection (cp. El 125),

<sup>141</sup> On the Swedish *edsöre* legislation, see Lindkvist 2003: 230, and Schück 2003: 395.

<sup>142</sup> This interpretation is also suggested by Liebermann, who translates the decree as follows: 'Und wer Friedlosenwerk verübt: [da] verfüge der König über den Frieden [den jener sich wiederkaufe]' (Liebermann 1903–16: I, 317) ('and whoever commits a crime leading to outlawry: [then] the king is free to decide about the peace [which one buys back for himself]'). Likewise, Clark Hall translates the simplex in this context as 'restoration of rights (to an outlaw)' (Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *frid*).

but rather to lack of the personal right to protection offered by the legal society one should be part of (cp. the *DOE*: s.v. *frīðlēas*). Thus, Steenstrup (Steenstrup 1882: 252) and von See (von See 1964: 158) could be right when suggesting that, in this context, OE *frīðlēas* is a Norse-derived loan-translation (cp. OIc *frīðlauss* ‘outlawed, proscribed’).<sup>143</sup> It could, of course, also be the case that OE *frīð* developed the new meaning independently as a result to the changes undergone by the process of outlawry in late Anglo-Saxon England (see above, 2.4.1.E; cp. OFris. *fretholās* ‘outlawed’, MLG *vredelōs* id., MHG *vridelōs* id.; see Carr 1939: 89).

(I) OE *grīð* ‘protection, sanctuary’: This noun belongs to the stock of terms recorded in Old English texts which are most frequently attributed a Norse-derived character (cp. OIc *grīð* pl. ‘truce, peace’; see Björkman 1900–02: 163 and 212, Holthausen 1934; s.v. *grīð*, Serjeantson 1935: 66–67, the *MED*: s.v. *griþ*, Hofmann 1955: §§204, 207, 302, de Vries 1961: s.v. *grīð*, Peters 1981: 89, Kisbye 1982a: 53, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *grith*, Townend 2002: 203, Dance 2003: 357, and Kries 2003: 315). This attribution cannot be done on phonological grounds, though, because the etymology of the Norse term remains uncertain. Von See (von See 1964: 167) records the most likely explanations suggested before his book was published (cp. Magnússon 1989: s.v. *grīð*):

(I.1) the term shares the same root as OIc *greiða* (cp. OE *gerædan* ‘to arrange, dispose, direct’ < PGmc *\*zaraiðjanan* < PIE *\*-rēidʰ-*; see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. 1. *ar-*, and Lehmann 1986: s.v. *garedan*);

(I.2) it shares the same root as Go. *griþs* ‘step’, which is itself of uncertain etymology (possibly < PIE *\*gʰredʰ-* or *\*gʰreidʰ-*, according to Lehmann 1986: s.v. *griþs*);

(I.3) it should be associated with Gr. *χάρις*, *-ιτος* ‘outward grace, favour’ (< PIE *\*gʰer-*; thus, PIE *\*gʰ(e)reH₂it-* or *\*gʰ(e)rīt-*; see Boisacq 1950: s.v. *χαίρω*, and Chantraine 1968: s.v. *χάρις*);<sup>144</sup>

(I.4) it is related to Skr. *grhá-* ‘house’, according to which it could be compared to Go. *gairda* ‘girdle’, which Lehmann (Lehmann 1986: s.v. *gairda*) derives from PIE *\*gʰerdʰ-* (cp. Rix and others 2001: 197 n. 1), or to Go. *gards*

<sup>143</sup> As already noted by von See (von See 1964: 158), the Norse compound is most commonly used in East Scandinavian law-codes, and in particular in those from Denmark (e.g. SkL I.90, JL II.1.14), whereas Swedish codes have both OEN *frīðlauss* and *biltogher* (e.g. UL Æ 21, VmL Ku 6).

<sup>144</sup> However, Pokorny (Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *\*gʰer-*), Jóhannesson (Jóhannesson 1956: s.v. *\*gʰer-*), and Orel (Orel 2003: s.vv. *\*zreduz* and *\*zridō*) associate OIc *grīð* ‘frantic eagerness’ rather than OIc *grīð* with this root.

'house, family, court' (cp. OIc *garðr* 'yard', OE *geard* id. < PGmc *\*zard-*), which may derive from PIE *\*ǵ<sup>h</sup>ort-* or *\*ǵ<sup>h</sup>ord<sup>h</sup>-*, based on PIE *\*ǵ<sup>h</sup>er-* and *\*ǵ<sup>h</sup>erd<sup>h</sup>-*, respectively (see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *ǵ<sup>h</sup>erd<sup>h</sup>-*, Lehmann 1986: s.v. *gards*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*zardaz*).

To these suggestions we should add Mann's (Mann 1984–87: s.v. *ghrīdh-*) recent derivation of OIc *grīð* and *grīði* 'servant' from PIE *\*ǵ<sup>h</sup>rīd<sup>h</sup>-*; he would also like to associate OSl. *grīdi* 'retainer, retinue', possibly a Germanic loan-word, and *grīzdq*, *grīditi* 'to be billeted' with this root. The presence of the dental fricative in *grīð* instead of /d/ can only be accepted as evidence of Norse derivation if the Proto-Germanic root had *\*/ð/* either as the reflex of PIE *\*/d<sup>h</sup>/* or as the result of PGmc *\*/θ/* (< PIE *\*/t/*) having been affected by Verner's Law (see above, 2.2.2.3; on OIc *greiða*, see further below, III.1.8.A). Even though many of the roots brought forward have the Proto-Indo-European voiced aspirated dental consonant (including I.4, which is the most likely explanation), not all of them do. Thus, the apparent lack of cognates in other West Germanic languages and the late attestation of the term (see below, I.39.2) become the most important evidence of its Norse-derived character.

Together with OE *lagu*, OE *grīð* is one of the most productive Norse-derived words in Old English texts. However, unlike the OE *lagu* complexes, most of the complexes belonging to the OE *grīð* word-field can easily be identified as English (in some cases, specifically Wulfstanian) new formations:<sup>145</sup> OE *cyricgrīð* 'sanctuary' (OE *cyrice* 'church' + OE *grīð*); OE *grīðbryce* 'breach of peace, penalty for such breach' (OE *grīð* + OE *bryce* 'breach'; cp. OIc *grīðabrek* 'breach of truce'); OE *grīðian* 'to make a truce or peace', which may be a new formation mirroring OE *frīðian* 'to be at peace with, protect, preserve', or a loan-word based on ODa. *\*grutha*, the verb which lies behind the two participial forms 'gruthær' and 'gruthathær' in ESjL II.10 and II.12 (see Steenstrup 1882: 249, and Hofmann 1955: §269); OE *grīðlagu* 'law of temporary or local peace' (OE *grīð* + OE *lagu*); OE *grīðlēas* 'without the ability to offer protection, unprotected' (cp. OE *frīðlēas* 'outlawed' and OIc *grīðalauss* 'without truce'); OE *hādgrīð* 'privileges (as regards peace) of holy orders' (OE *hād* 'order, office' + OE *grīð*); OE *hælnesgrīð* 'peace-privileges attached to a sanctuary' (OE *hælnes* 'sanctuary' + OE *grīð*); OE *handgrīð* 'security, peace, protection given by the king's hand' (OE *hand* 'hand' + OE *grīð*); and OE *ungrīð* 'enmity' (OE *un-* + OE *grīð*).

<sup>145</sup> On the significant role played by Archbishop Wulfstan in the development of this word-field, see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 155–57, 235–39, and 252–56.



(J) OE *hamele* ‘rowlock’: Thier (Thier 2002: 170) suggests that the expression *æt hamelan* in ChronD (Cubbin) 1040 = ChronE (Irvine) 1039 (cp. ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1040; see above, 2.2.1.5.A) is likely to represent the Viking Age Norse equivalent of OIc *til hǫmlu* ‘per person’ (cp. OIc *hamla* ‘oar-thong’ < PGmc *\*xam(a)lōn*; cp. de Vries 1961: s.v. *hamla*). While the noun seems to be associated with OIc *hemja* ‘to restrain, hold back from roving about’, and hence with OE *hemman* ‘to stop up, close’, the only other cognate of OIc *hamla* in the Germanic languages may be OHG *hamila* ‘satyrion, orchis’ (see Orel 2003: s.v. *\*xam(a)lōn*).

(K) OE *hāmsōcn* ‘offence of attacking a man in his own house; the privilege to judge that crime and to receive the fine to be paid for it’: This compound is first recorded in the tenth century (see below, I.43). Its late attestation and the fact that older texts seem to refer to similar attacks with OE *-bryce* compounds (e.g. OE *burhbryce* ‘forcible entry into a fortification or dwelling’, and OE *eadorbryce* ‘forced entry into one’s enclosure’; cp. OE *hūsbyrce* ‘offence of attacking a man in his own house’ in LawIICn 64)<sup>146</sup> have led to the frequent analysis of the compound as a Norse-derived loan-translation (cp. OIc *heim-sókn* ‘inroad, attack on one’s home; visit’; see Björkman 1900–02: 12, Carr 1939: 28, Hofmann 1955: §207, de Vries 1961: s.v. *heimsókn*, Peters 1981: 92, Kisbye 1982a: 55, and Townend 2002: 203). Given scholarly tradition and the lack of strong evidence against this suggestion, the possible Norse derivation of the compound is accepted here. However, we should not forget that, as already noted by Bibire, OE *gesēcan* does not only mean ‘to seek out, visit’, but it also has a well-attested secondary sense ‘to seek with hostile intent, try to get at, attack’ (cp. Go. *sókjan* ‘to seek; argue with’) (Bibire 2001: 90); this semantic range is also attested for OE *sōcn* ‘seeking; seeking with hostile intent, attack’ (see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.vv. *sēcan*, sense III, and *sōcn*, sense VII).<sup>147</sup> Furthermore, the crime it refers to is commonly dealt with not only in Scandinavian sources, but also in Continental texts (see R. Colman 1981 and R. Colman 1985); accordingly, similar compounds with the same meaning are well-attested in other West Germanic languages (e.g. OFris. *hāmsēke(ne)*, *hām-sēkinge* and MHG *heim(e)suochunge*). Thus, Norse derivation is not beyond doubt (cp. the MED: s.v. *hām-sōkne*, and the OED 1989: s.v. *hamesucken*, *soken*;

<sup>146</sup> OE *hūsbyrce* is attributed the same meaning as OE *hāmsōcn* rather than ‘house-breaking’ in keeping with Colman’s detailed study of these terms (R. Colman 1981).

<sup>147</sup> After all, PGmc *\*sak-* (cp. OE *sacu* ‘conflict, strife’, *sacan* ‘to dispute, disagree’) and *\*sōk-* (cp. OE *sēcan*, *sōcn*) are ablaut variants of the same root (cp. OFris. *sēka*, a cognate of OE *sēcan*, which has a meaning similar to OE *sacan*, viz. ‘to accuse (of), challenge’).



cf. above, 2.1). Thus, despite the closer formal similarity with the Norse term, OE *hāmsōcn* may have developed as a result of continental influence.<sup>148</sup>

(L) OE *healdan* ‘to hold’: Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §§367 and 393; cp. Peters 1981: 88) suggests that, when used intransitively with the specialized meaning ‘to steer (a ship), travel’ in some annals of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (see below, I.45), this verb mirrors its Norse cognate. Jesch (Jesch 2001b: 174–75) explains that in the earliest Scandinavian sources the idea of keeping a ship on a particular course was most commonly expressed by means of the verb represented by OIc *halda* and an adverb of direction.<sup>149</sup> Hofmann emphasizes the fact that the last two occurrences of the term with the seemingly Norse sense are associated with some Danish troops. However, the first occurrence of the term is associated with the fleet gathered by Godwine; therefore, it is difficult to make much out of the other occurrences.

(M) OE *hyttan* ‘to meet someone’: This verb is only recorded in very late Old English texts (see below, I.52). Given its late attestation and the apparent lack of cognates in other Germanic languages (see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *keid-*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *hitta*, and Magnússon 1989: s.v. 1 *hitta*), OE *hyttan* is commonly analysed as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *hitta* ‘to hit upon, to meet with one’; see Björkman 1900–02: 213–14, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *hittan*, Serjeantson 1935: 70, Hofmann 1955: §371, Peters 1981: 97, and Dance 2003: 360). Dance (Dance 2003: 120) suggests that <y> (<hytte> in ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.27) is an indication that ON /i/ has undergone rounding in Old English, probably by analogy with other weak Class I verbs with [ytt], which may indicate, through phonaesthesia, something like ‘physical force in a pushing or pressing action’ (cp. OE *dyttan* ‘to shut, close’, *bryttan* ‘to crush’; cp. the MED: s.v. *hitten*). The presence of /y/ in the verb would certainly help explain <hutte> in Lazamon’s *Brut* (see Dance 2003: 120); however, we should

<sup>148</sup> Cp. L *haraidum*, which refers to a band of men perpetrating *hāmsōcn* in LawHn 80.11. It has been associated with ‘hariraida’ in *Lex Ribuaria* 64 and ‘heriraita’ in *Lex Baiuvariorum* IV.23; see Downer 1972: 400 n. to LawHn 80.11 and R. Colman 1985: 52. The DMLBS (s.v. *haraidum*) explains it instead as a result of the influence of OE *here* ‘troop, army’ on AN *arraie* / *arai* ‘company, body of men’ (see AND: s.v. *arraie*, *arrai*, *arai*).

<sup>149</sup> The usage may be a leftover from the original meaning of the root rather than an innovation, for it could be the case that the original root (PIE *\*kel-*?) meant ‘to drive’ (cp. Skr. *kalāyati* ‘to impel, bear’, Gr. *κἔλλω* ‘to drive; to land a ship’, Toch. B *kāl(t)s-* ‘to goad, drive’; see Rix and others 2001: 348–49, s.v. *\*kel-*, Orel 2003: s.v. *\*xaldanan*, and Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.v. *halda*).

not forget that OE <y> may simply be a spelling variant of <i> (cp. <gehitte> in LS 9 (Giles) 291, and Holthausen 1934: s.v. *bittan*).

(N) OE *lest* ‘fault, sin’: This noun, which is only attested, as far as the *OEC* is concerned, in the eleventh-century homily HomS 30 (TristrApp 2) (see below, I.53), is commonly considered to be Norse-derived (cp. OIc *løstr* ‘fault, flaw’ < PGmc \**laxstuz*, on the loss of /x/, see Noreen 1923: §222.2; see Björkman 1900–02: 249, Napier 1905–06: 305, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *lest*, Serjeantson 1935: 70, the *MED*: s.v. *last*, n.3, Peters 1981: 97, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *last* n.<sup>3</sup>, and Dance 2003: 365). The Norse term is related to OE *leahor* ‘vice, sin, offence’ and MDu. *lachter* ‘disgrace, scorn’ (< PGmc \**laxtraz*); thus, we may have expected the root to exhibit breaking. Yet, given the date of the text where it is recorded, the apparent lack of breaking cannot be brought forward as suggestive of Norse derivation because <æ> could represent late Old English monophthongization (see Hogg 1992: §§5.206–14). It could also be the case that the loss of the velar took place before breaking, possibly by analogy with other forms (cp. OFris. *laster* ‘slander, damage’, OHG / OS *lastar* ‘disgrace’, MDu. *laster* ‘disgrace, scorn’ < PGmc \**laxstran*; see Orel 2003: s.vv. \**laxstran* and \**laxstuz*, and Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.v. *laster*). The late attestation of the noun, therefore, has to be taken as the main factor in favour of its Norse origin.

(O) OE *nīðing* ‘wretch, villain, coward’: This noun is generally analysed as a Norse-derived term (cp. OIc *nīðingr* ‘villain, scoundrel; apostate’; see Björkman 1900–02: 164 and 217, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *nīðing*, Serjeantson 1935: 65–66, the *MED*: s.v. *nīthing*, Hofmann 1955: §351, de Vries 1961: s.v. *nīðingr*, Peters 1981: 90, Kisbye 1982a: 54, the *OED* 2000–: s.v. *nīthing*, and Dance 2003: 370; cf. Amira 1922: 64). However, despite the presence of the dental fricative, nothing in its form argues in favour of a foreign rather than a native origin, because the base of the derivative should be associated, not only with OIc *nīð* ‘contumely, libel’, but also with Go. *neip* ‘envy, spite’, OE *nīð* ‘strife, enmity’, and OS *nīth* ‘jealousy, hatred’ (< PGmc \**nīþan* / \**nīþaz* < PIE \**nīt-*; cp. MHG *nīdinc* ‘envious person’). Any suggestion in favour of its Norse origin has to rely instead on the following facts:

(O.1) it is first recorded in texts dating from a period when the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact had been under way for a while (see below, I.63);

(O.2) its earliest uses seem to reflect the same moral implications as those recorded for the Norse term in Scandinavian texts (see further below, 3.4.2.2.B).

The term seems to have become integrated into Old English fairly swiftly, probably thanks to the existence of the related OE *nīð* word-field, for the derivative OE *unnīðing* ‘honest man’ is recorded in ChronE (Irvine) 1087.73. The derivative may be a native new formation or a loan-blend based on the Viking

Age Norse noun attested as **unipik**, nom. sing., in Ög. 77 (Brate 1911–18: 78–79; cp. OIc *úniðingr* ‘unvillainous’).

(P) OE *ōc* ‘and’: If the vowel in the conjunction were /o:/, this word should be discussed together with those mentioned in 2.2.1.2 because it would be a clear reflex of the Norse cognate of OE *ēac* ‘also, likewise’ (< PGmc \*auke; cp. OIc *auk* ‘also’; see Björkman 1900–02: 72, de Vries 1961: s.v. *auk*, etc.). It is, however, more likely that, as suggested by Stanley (Stanley 1983: 144–45), the vowel is /o/, in which case the term could be understood as a reflex of the unstressed Viking Age Norse conjunction **auk**, attested, for instance, in Ög. 20 (Brate 1911–18: 18–19; cp. OIc *ok* ‘and, and yet, but’). It could, however, also be the case that <oc> is a by-form of OE *ac* ‘but’ (cp. unstressed OE *ot-* and *-poþ* besides the more common *et-* and *-peþ* ‘path’; see Stanley 1983: 146, with references, and Hogg 1992: §§2.88, 5.7 and 6.4–5). Given that phonology cannot help us to make a decision, other factors have to be taken into account. The *OEC* records ‘oc’ in the following texts:

(P.1) Ch 1863 (Finberg), an eleventh-century charter referring to a grant of land in Devon, with probably south-western origin (see *Electronic Sawyer* no. 1863): The dialectal origin of the document, together with the fact that OE *ac* can be devoid of adversative force when it ‘introduces a phrase, clause of sentence not immediately following a negative statement’ (Stanley 1983: 145), suggests that this is likely the native by-form.

(P.2) Scrib 3.1 (Ker), the scribble in Arras, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 764, fols 89<sup>v</sup>–90<sup>r</sup>, which also records <(h)æil> (see above, 2.2.1.1.A): While Förster (Förster 1932b: 24 n. 107) transcribes the term as <ac>, Ker (Ker 1990: no. 4) prefers the reading <oc>. If we follow Förster’s transcription, there is not much need to posit Norse derivation; if we follow Ker’s reading, the possibility of Norse influence comes back into the picture (cp. Stanley 1983: 147). A tenth-century date for the inscription, suggested by Ker, could be taken as an argument against the attestation of the Norse conjunction in Old English, while Förster’s attribution to the late eleventh century (see below, II.255), the non-adversative meaning of the particle, and the possible attestation of another non-technical loan-word in the inscription would be in keeping with an argument in favour of the Norse derivation of the term. Given the problems involved in the interpretation of this word, its etymology has to remain unclear and the possibility of its Norse derivation cannot be easily rejected.

(P.3) Interpolations and Continuations in the *Peterborough Chronicle*: The dialectal origin of the passages would argue in favour of Norse derivation

(see below, II.163.18; cp. C. Clark 1970: lxiii, and Kniezsa 1994: 241–43).<sup>150</sup> However, the facts that the majority of uses of the particle in these annals is adversative, that the annals alternate <oc> and <ac> forms without distinction, and that there is no attestation of the Norse-derived adverb *ōc* suggest that <oc> here is likely to be the native by-form (cp. Stanley 1983: 149).

(Q) OE *orrest* ‘battle, combat, legal battle’: This term is only recorded, as far as our corpus is concerned, in very late texts (see below, I.67). It is commonly identified as a Norse-derived loan-word based on the Viking Age Norse term which is recorded in runic inscriptions as **orostu** (Sö. 126; Brate and Wessén 1924–36: 94), **uristu** (Vg. 40; Jungner and Svärdström 1940–71: 58–60), **urustu** (Sö. 338; Brate and Wessén 1924–36: 323–30), etc. (cp. OIc *orrosta*, *orrasta*, *orresta* ‘battle, strife’; see Björkman 1900–02: 218, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *orrest*, Serjeantson 1935: 73, de Vries 1961: s.v. *orrosta*, *orrasta*, *orresta*, Peters 1981: 90, Kisbye 1982a: 50, and Kniezsa 1994: 241; see Jesch 2001b: 59 and 61 on the Norse term). The etymology of the Norse noun is uncertain, but it is likely to be related to OE *eornost* ‘earnestness, seriousness’ and OHG *ernust* id. (see de Vries 1961: s.vv. *ern*, *erra*, and *orrosta*). The late attestation of OE *orrest* and the lack of direct cognates in other Germanic languages seem to argue in favour of its Norse derivation. Notably, late Old English texts (e.g. LawWILad 1, 1.1, 2, 2.1, etc.) also record OE *ornest* ‘trial by battle’, which could be interpreted as a by-form of OE *eornost*. <o> is likely to represent an ablaut variant (cp. the Norse term; cp. the OED 1989: s.v. *earnest* n.1), but it could also be the reflex of the monophthongization of /eo/.<sup>151</sup> Admittedly, it is hard to identify this term with OE *orrest* because, even though /n/ is occasionally assimilated to /r/ in Old English, assimilation usually works leftwards (Hogg 1992: §7.91). Thus, it may be best to consider the latter as Norse-derived and to suggest that the existence of a closely related noun would have facilitated its incorporation into the Old English lexicon. If OE *ornest* is considered to be a by-form of OE *eornost*, its attestations could exemplify a process of confusion between the native term and the loan-word, whereby a new word has been created on the basis of the native term, but with some formal and semantic features of the Norse word (cp. Bloomfield 1969: 554 n. 34).

<sup>150</sup> Viz. ChronE (Irvine) 654.12, ChronE (Irvine) 656.112, ChronE (Irvine) 656.56, ChronE (Irvine) 656.60, ChronE (Irvine) 1124.46, ChronE (Irvine) 1127.10, ChronE (Irvine) 1127.18, ChronE (Irvine) 1127.25, ChronE (Irvine) 1128.3, ChronE (Irvine) 1128.13, and ChronE (Irvine) 1130.18.

<sup>151</sup> The DOE (s.v. *eornost*) does not associate the two terms, though.

(R) OE *stōr* ‘strong, violent’: It is first recorded in ChronE (Irvine) 1085b.21 (see below, I.84), and its late attestation has aroused the suspicion amongst scholars in favour of its likely Norse derivation (cp. OIc *stórr* ‘big, great’; see Björkman 1900–02: 221, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *stōr*, Serjeantson 1935: 78, de Vries 1961: s.v. *stórr*, Peters 1981: 98, the OED 1989: s.v. *stour*, *stoor*, a. and n.<sup>2</sup>, Kniezsa 1994: 241, and Dance 2003: 377). However, the existence of cognates in other West Germanic languages (e.g. OFris. *stōr* ‘big, important’, OHG / OS *stōri* ‘famous’) and the fact that the attestations of the adjective are not particularly associated with Scandinavianized areas during either the Old or the Middle English period have led other scholars to doubt that derivation (see the MED: s.v. *stōre*, adj., Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *stā*, *stā*–E.12, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*stōraz*; cp. Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.v. *stera*). Indeed, other than the late attestation of the term in Old English texts and the common use of the Norse term in Scandinavian sources, there is no strong evidence in favour of its Norse origin. Because of scholarly tradition and the consistent handling of data (cp. OE *cnīf*; see above, 2.5.B), this adjective is, however, included in the main body of this study.

(S) OE *taperex* ‘small axe’: This compound is only recorded in the OEC in the Canterbury charter Ch 959 (Rob 82) and derivative contexts in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (see below, I.87). The determinant seems to represent OCl. *toporū* ‘axe’, which was borrowed into Old Norse and was integrated in a pleonastic compound (cp. OIc *taparøx* ‘small axe’; see F. Fischer 1909: 45, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *taparøx*). Given that the Scandinavians seem to have had more dealings with the Slavs than the Anglo-Saxons (see F. Fischer 1909: 44–45, Cross 1935, and Duczko 2004) and that the term is not recorded until the late Old English period, it seems quite likely that the compound is a Norse-derived loan-blend modelled on the Norse compound (see Björkman 1900–02: 256, Hofmann 1955: §335, Peters 1981: 99, and Kisbye 1982a: 50).

## 2.6. Conclusion

This chapter has discussed the Old English terms that can be considered to be Norse-derived with some degree of certainty or, at least, probability. As noted above, 2.1, not all types of evidence are equally reliable, and we can even identify differences in terms of reliability amongst the phonological and morphological features, which are the strongest evidence scholars can rely on when trying to identify Norse-derived terms recorded in Old English texts. It is clear, then, that Norse derivation can be claimed with more certainty in some cases than in others (cf., for instance, OE *scegð* and *tacan* vs OE *cnīf* and *stōr*). While

there is not much we can do to avoid this problem, it is important to bear it in mind when trying to identify the specific Norse-derived terms in Old English and their implications for the sociolinguistic situation surrounding the linguistic contact between speakers of the two languages.

This chapter has studied the Norse-derived terms in isolation, assessing the evidence for their foreign origin on an individual basis. The remaining chapters, on the other hand, analyse the terms in a wider context, viz. their lexico-semantic fields (Chapter 3) and some of the texts where they are recorded (Chapter 4).

## LEXICO-SEMANTIC STUDY

### *3.1. Introduction*

This chapter aims to study the integration of the Norse-derived terms into the Old English lexicon in general and their lexico-semantic fields in particular. In order to do so we need to establish how they interact with other Old English terms and, therefore, when, how, and why they are used. The chapter starts by analysing the chronological and dialectal distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Old English texts. Partially on the basis of this information, the second part of the chapter explores the position of the terms in their lexico-semantic fields in terms of coreness or periphery.

### *3.2. Grammatical Categories and Lexico-Semantic Fields*

#### **3.2.1. Initial Theoretical Remarks**

It is generally accepted that not all grammatical categories are equally prone to borrowing, just as not all lexico-semantic fields are as easily affected by this process. Thus, it is common to find scales of borrowability in works dealing with language contact (e.g. Haugen 1950a: 223–24, Lefebvre 1984: 14, McMahon 1994: 204–11, Haspelmath 2008, and Tadmor 2009). Thomason (Thomason 2001: 70–71) offers a detailed scale, summarized in Table 1.



Table 1. The effects of borrowing.

Type of contact	Lexical borrowing	Structural borrowing
Casual*	Non-basic vocabulary; only content words (most often nouns)	None
Slightly more intense†	Non-basic vocabulary; content words and function words	Minor, with no introduction of features that would alter the types of structures found in the borrowing language
More intense‡	Basic vocabulary; more function words (including pronouns, low numerals, and derivational suffixes)	More significant structural features, although usually without resulting in a major typological change
Intense§	Heavy borrowing in all sections of the lexicon	Heavy structural borrowing, including borrowing which results in major typological changes

\* 'Borrowers need not be fluent in the source language, and/or few bilinguals among borrowing-language speakers' (Thomason 2001: 70).

† 'Borrowers must be reasonably fluent bilinguals, but they are probably a minority among borrowing-language speakers' (Thomason 2001: 70).

‡ 'More bilinguals, attitudes and other social factors favouring borrowing' (Thomason 2001: 70).

§ 'Very extensive bilingualism among borrowing language speakers, social factors strongly favouring borrowing' (Thomason 2001: 70).

As Thomason (Thomason 2001: 71) points out, this scale can be altered when the linguistic contact involves typologically similar languages because their similarity would make structural borrowing easier (cp. above, 1.6.2.2).

We should remember, however, that borrowing is not the only mechanism by which foreign material can become part of a language. A second mechanism, imposition, also plays a significant role. Van Coetsem distinguishes between the two mechanisms as follows:

If the recipient language speaker is the agent, as in the case of an English speaker using French words while speaking English, the transfer of material [...] from the source language to the recipient language is *borrowing* (*recipient language agentivity*). If, on the other hand, the source language speaker is the agent, as in the case of a French speaker using his French articulatory habits while speaking English, the transfer of material from the source language to the recipient language is *imposition* (*source language agentivity*). (van Coetsem 1988: 3)

The effects of imposition differ from those of borrowing. In van Coetsem's words, the difference lies in that 'the transfer of material from the source language to the recipient language primarily concerns less stable domains, par-

ticularly vocabulary, in borrowing, and more stable domains, particularly phonological entities, in imposition' (van Coetsem 1988: 3). At the lexical level, imposition can result in the transfer of basic vocabulary and functional words, which, as Table 1 indicates, only tends to take place in borrowing when the level of linguistic contact involves significant intensity (see also Thomason 2001: 74–76, where 'shift-induced interference' is used instead of 'imposition', Winford 2005, and Haspelmath 2009: 50–51).

Scholars have frequently noticed various differences between the Norse-derived terms first recorded during the Old and Middle English periods, respectively (cp. above, 1.3.2):

- (1) The Norse-derived terms first attested during the Old English period tend to have an English form, commonly achieved by the substitution of an English sound for an unexpected Norse sound, while a larger proportion of Norse-derived terms first attested during the Middle English period retain a Norse form (see Townend 2002: 201, and above, 2.1).
- (2) The Norse-derived terms first attested during the Old English period tend to have a technical character and in many cases refer to objects or customs associated with the Scandinavian newcomers, while those which are first recorded during the Middle English period tend to refer rather to non-technical, everyday issues (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 1, with references). Similarly, it is mainly in Middle English texts that we find the attestation of Norse-derived terms belonging to closed grammatical categories (prepositions, conjunctions, personal pronouns, etc.); Appendix IV records some examples.

The differing effects of borrowing and imposition can be brought into the discussion so as to account for these differences: while most of the terms first recorded during the Old English period may be attributable to borrowing, the terms first recorded during the Middle English period may in the main represent imposition (see Townend 2002: 201–04; cp. McMahon 1994: 205).

The rest of this section analyses in detail the grammatical categories and lexico-semantic fields that the Norse-derived terms attested during the Old English period belong to.

### 3.2.2. Grammatical Categories

Table 2 classifies the Norse-derived terms discussed in Chapter 2 into the grammatical categories they belong to. No distinction is made between loans and new formations because of the difficulty of doing so in many cases.

Table 2. Classification of the Norse-derived terms according to grammatical categories.

	Terms <sup>†</sup>	Total
<b>Nouns</b>	<i>ǣlding</i> , <i>ærfle</i> , <i>ārmorgen</i> , <i>band</i> , <i>barð</i> ( <i>barða</i> ), <i>bōnda</i> ( <i>bōndeland</i> , <i>hūs bōnda</i> ), <i>brýðhlöþ</i> , <i>brynige</i> ( <i>healsbrynige</i> ), * <i>carl</i> ( <i>būtsecarl</i> , <i>carlfugol</i> , <i>carlmann</i> , <i>hūscarl</i> ), <i>cnearr</i> ( <i>nægledcnearr</i> ), <i>cnīf</i> , * <i>cōp</i> ( <i>caupland</i> , <i>lahcōp</i> , <i>landcōp</i> ), <i>cost</i> , <i>cwenfugol</i> , <i>dearfscipe</i> , <i>dreng</i> , <i>drincelēan</i> , <i>eorl</i> ( <i>eorldōm</i> , <i>eorlgyfu</i> , <i>eorlriht</i> ), <i>efne</i> , * <i>fet</i> ( <i>sadolfet</i> ), <i>fēolaga</i> ( <i>fēolagscipe</i> ), <i>feste</i> ( <i>fēstermann</i> ), <i>flēge</i> , <i>frīð</i> , <i>gersum(a)</i> , <i>gestning</i> , <i>grīð</i> ( <i>cyricgrīð</i> , <i>grīðbryce</i> , <i>hādgrīð</i> , <i>hǣlnesgrīð</i> , <i>handgrīð</i> , <i>ungrīð</i> ), <i>hā</i> ( <i>hāsċeta</i> ), <i>hamele</i> , <i>hāmsōcn</i> , <i>hofding</i> , <i>hold</i> , <i>holm</i> , <i>hundred</i> , <i>hūsting</i> , <i>læst</i> , <i>lagu</i> ( <i>burhlagu</i> , <i>fōlcragu</i> , <i>grīðlagu</i> , <i>lahbreca</i> , <i>lahbrecende</i> , <i>lahbryce</i> , <i>lahcċap</i> , <i>lahmann</i> , <i>lahriht</i> , <i>lahslite</i> , <i>lahwita</i> , <i>lahgewrit</i> , <i>landlagu</i> , <i>mǣglagu</i> , <i>prēostlagu</i> , <i>regollagu</i> , <i>rihtlagu</i> , <i>ðegnlagu</i> , <i>unlagagield</i> , <i>unlagu</i> , <i>ūtlaga</i> , <i>ūtlagu</i> , <i>woruldlagu</i> ), <i>lið</i> ( <i>liðsmann</i> , <i>sciplið</i> , <i>sumorlida</i> ), <i>loft</i> , <i>lysing</i> , <i>māl</i> ( <i>formāl(a)</i> / <i>formæl</i> , <i>frīðmāl</i> , * <i>māldæg</i> , * <i>wīðermāl</i> ), <i>manslot</i> , <i>marc</i> ( <i>healfmarc</i> ), * <i>mund</i> , <i>nām</i> , <i>nīðing</i> ( <i>unniðing</i> ), <i>ōra</i> ( <i>ȳre</i> / <i>ēre</i> ), <i>orrest</i> , <i>plōgesland</i> , * <i>ran</i> ( <i>cyricrēn</i> ), <i>rōt</i> , <i>sahþ</i> ( <i>sahþnes</i> , <i>unsahþ</i> ), * <i>sōl</i> ( <i>sōlmerca</i> ), <i>sandermann</i> , <i>song</i> , <i>scegð</i> ( <i>scegðmann</i> ), <i>sceppe</i> , <i>scinn</i> , <i>scoru</i> , <i>sticca</i> , <i>swegen</i> , * <i>tac</i> ( <i>wǣpentac</i> ), * <i>taper</i> ( <i>taperex</i> ), <i>toft</i> , <i>ðir</i> , <i>ðorp</i> , <i>ðrǣll</i> ( <i>ðrǣlriht</i> ), <i>ðrefe</i> , <i>wæð</i> , * <i>wal</i> ( <i>walrċaf</i> )	126
<b>Verbs</b>	<i>ceallian</i> , <i>crafian</i> ( <i>uncrafian</i> ), <i>gecrōcod</i> , <i>cwyddian</i> ( <i>uncwyddian</i> ), <i>eggian</i> , <i>farnian</i> , <i>gēatan</i> , <i>grīðian</i> , <i>healdan</i> , <i>hyttan</i> , <i>lagian</i> ( <i>inlagian</i> , <i>ūtlagian</i> ), <i>rennan</i> , <i>sahþlian</i> , <i>se(o)r[d/ð]an</i> , <i>tacan</i> ( <i>oftacan</i> )	20
<b>Adjectives</b>	<i>ǣlagol</i> , <i>ārlic</i> ( <i>ārmorgenlic</i> ), <i>dearf</i> , ( <i>dearflic</i> ), <i>frīðlēas</i> , * <i>grā</i> ( <i>grāscinnen</i> ), <i>goldwrecen</i> , <i>grīðlēas</i> , <i>heil</i> , <i>hearmascinnen</i> , <i>lahlic</i> , <i>norren</i> , <i>rōtfest</i> , <i>sac</i> ( <i>unsac</i> ), <i>saclēas</i> , <i>sahþ(e)</i> , <i>sammǣle</i> , <i>scēr</i> , <i>stōr</i> , <i>ūtlah</i>	22
<b>Adverbs</b>	<i>ār</i> ( <i>ārlice</i> ), <i>dearflice</i> , <i>fyrre(r)</i> , <i>lahlice</i> , <i>ðrinna</i>	6
<b>Pronouns</b>	<i>hānum</i>	1
<b>Prepositions</b>	<i>fra</i> / <i>fro</i> ( <i>fraward</i> )	2
<b>Conjunctions</b>	<i>bāðe</i> , <i>ōc</i>	2
<b>Phrases</b>	<i>beran ūp māl</i> , <i>cuman tō wīðermāle</i> , <i>hlēapan ūt</i> , <i>mund and māldeg</i> , <i>scylian of māle</i> , <i>tacan on</i> , <i>tacan wīð</i>	7

<sup>†</sup> Asterisks in this table mark words which are not attested as simplexes and words which are only attested as part of a phrase; the terms preceded by an asterisk have not been counted. The compounds which could be associated with two loans are included together with the determinatum.

Table 2 shows the predominance of terms belonging to open-ended grammatical categories amongst the Norse-derived terms recorded in Old English texts, thus fully agreeing with Thomason's (Thomason 2001: 70–71) scale of borrowability (see above, 3.2.1). Nouns are clearly the most numerous loans. A possible reason for the relative freedom with which nouns are borrowed may be that they

seem to be the most robust and independent word class, in that people can remember some nouns when all else fails. This is not just because there are many more nouns than verbs. It is probably because they are relatively free of syntactic restrictions. Verbs, on the other hand, are somewhat more vulnerable, perhaps because they are inextricably entangled with the syntax of the sentence. (Aitchison 1987: 102; cp. Tadmor 2009: 61–63)

The Norse derivation of the terms belonging to closed categories (viz. OE *bāðe*, *hānum*, *fra* / *fro*, and *ōc*) is not beyond doubt (see above, 2.4.2.C, 2.2.1.4.C, 2.2.2.6, and 2.5.P, respectively); it may, therefore, be the case that the Old English texts only record words belonging to open-ended categories. Even if these terms are accepted to be Norse-derived, it is important to bear in mind that they are recorded in late Old English texts associated in the main with the Scandinavianized areas (see below, 3.3). Their character and their attestation may suggest that they represent early examples of imposition rather than the results of borrowing in a situation of significantly intense linguistic contact (see above, 3.2.1).

The similarity between Old English and Old Norse and the fact that they shared a very high number of cognate terms must have facilitated borrowing of whole structures, be it phrasal verbs or particular collocations.

### 3.2.3. Lexico-Semantic Fields

Table 3 presents a classification of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Old English texts combining two related, albeit different, issues: lexico-semantic fields and registers. It is common in linguistics to distinguish between semantic and lexical fields: *semantic field* refers to the conceptual area covered by a *lexical field*, a group of paradigmatically associated lexemes (i.e. lexemes which are linked by various semantic relationships: synonymy, antonymy, hyperonymy, etc.; see further below, 3.4.1).<sup>1</sup> The term *lexico-semantic field* is preferred here in order to indicate that the fields referred to cover both semantic areas and the actual Old English terms which lexicalize those areas.

The distribution of the loans into lexico-semantic fields relies, generally speaking, on the semantic categories identified by the *TOE*.<sup>2</sup> Only slight alterations have been made to the *TOE*'s taxonomy on the basis of the nature of the attestations.

<sup>1</sup> On the relationship between *semantic* and *lexical field*, see further Öhman 1953; on the semantic structure of the lexicon, see Lehrer 1974.

<sup>2</sup> On the *TOE*'s folk taxonomy and its relationship to that employed in the *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary*, see the *TOE*: xxxi–xxxvi, Kay and others 2001, A. Fischer 2004, and the *Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary* 2009: xviii–xx.

Table 3. Classification of the Norse-derived terms into lexico-semantic fields and registers.

Semantic fields	Terms <sup>†</sup>	Total
<b>Content Words</b>		
<b>Technical terms</b>		
A. Crafts and trade	<i>cnif, goldwrecen, scinn (grāscinnen, hearmascinnen)</i>	5
B. Legal world	<i>brýðhlöf, *cōp (caupland, labcōp, landcōp), cost, crafian (uncrafian), cwyddian (uncwyddian), drincelēan, fēolaga (fēolagscipe), feste (fēstermann), frið (friðlēas), gersum(a), gēatan, grið (cyricgrið, griðbryce, griðian, griðlēas, hādgrīð, hēlnesgrið, handgrið, ungrīð), hāmsōcn, hlēapan út, hūsting, lagu (ælagol, burhlagu, fōlcragu, griðlagu, inlagian, lagian, labbreca, labbreccende, labbryce, labcēap, lablic, lablice, lahmann, labriht, lahslite, lahwiata, lahgewrit, landlagu, mēæglagu, prēostlagu, regollagu, rihtlagu, ðegnlagu, unlagagiæld, unlagu, ütlah, ütлага, ütlagian, ütlagu, woruldsragu), māl (formāl(a) / formæġ, friðmāl, *māldæg (mund and māldeg), sammæle, scylian of mæle, *wiðermāl (cuman tō wiðermæle)), *mund (*mund and māldeg), nām, nūðing (unniðing), orrest, *ran (cyricrēn), sac (unsac), saclēas, saht (saht(e), sahtlian, sahtnes, unsaht), scēr, wabrēaf, wāpēntac</i>	84
C. Martial activities	<i>brynige (healsbrynige), biūtsecarl, dreng, hāsæta, lið (liðsmann, sciplið, sumorlida), taperex</i>	10
D. Measurements and amounts	<i>hundred, manslot, plōgesland, sceppe, scoru, sticca, ðrefe, ðrinna</i>	8
E. Monetary terms	<i>marc (healfmarc), ōra (ȝre / ēre)</i>	4
F. Navigation	<i>barð (barða), cnearr (negledcnearr), flēge, hā, hamele, healdan, scegð (scegðmann)</i>	10
G. Social status	<i>bōnda (bōndeland, hūs bōnda), eorl (eorldōm, eorlgýfu, eorlriht), hofðing, hold, hūscarl, lȝsing, ðir, ðræll (ðrælrīht)</i>	14
<b>Total</b>		<b>135</b>
<b>Non-technical terms</b>		
H. Communication	<i>ceallian, eggian</i>	2
I. Life, death, and existence	<i>ærfle, band, *carl (carlfugol, carlmann), gecrōcod, cwenfugol, hæil, norren, rennan, swegen, rōt (rōtfæst), stōr, tacan on</i>	14
J. Material needs	<i>ælding, song, toft, ðorþ</i>	4
K. Opinion and action	<i>cost, dearf, (dearflic, dearflīce, dearfscipe), farnian, læst</i>	7

Semantic fields	Terms <sup>†</sup>	Total
L. Physical world and matter	<i>efne, holm, loft, wæð, *söl (sölmerca)</i>	5
M. Possession and property	<i>*fæt (sadolǣt), gersum(a), gēatan, tacan (tacan wið)</i>	5
N. Social interaction	<i>gestning, hyttan, ofiacan, sandermann, se(o)r[d/ð]an</i>	5
O. Temporal reference	<i>ār (ārlic, ārmorgen, ārmorgenlic, ārlice), fyrre(r)</i>	6
Total		48
Function Words		
P.	<i>bāðe, fra / fro (fraward), hānum, ōc</i>	5

<sup>†</sup> Asterisks in this table mark words which are not attested as simplexes and words which are only attested as part of a collocation; the terms preceded by an asterisk have not been counted.

Needless to say, the classification presented in Table 3 could be altered, not only with regard to the categories themselves but also in connection with the category specific terms are associated with. In some cases, e.g. OE *dreng* (see below, 3.4.2.3.B), the meaning of the term is not clear. In an article analysing the Old English terms for ‘wind’ and ‘weather’, Kotzor (Kotzor 1985: 176) summarizes the methods available for the study of Old English vocabulary:

- (1) The translational method, i.e. the use of linguistic material translated from one language into another, especially in the form of glossaries, glosses, and literary sources.
- (2) The contextual method, i.e. the determination and delimitation of semantic content by the use of linguistic (as well as extra-linguistic) context, especially in the form of collocation patterns, defining context, or delimiting context.
- (3) The diachronic method: the determination of semantic content with the aim of linguistic diachrony, i.e. for our purposes, with the aid of Middle English or Modern English material.
- (4) The morphological method: the establishing of paradigmatic patterns as an aid to semantic analysis, especially in the word-formation of the language concerned.
- (5) The etymological method,
- (6) the comparative method using material from cognate languages, and
- (7) the contact method evaluating language contact, especially loan relations, to establish or confirm the semantic content.

These methods do, of course, differ in terms of reliability, with text-internal and synchronic evidence being preferable to evidence relying on diachrony or comparison across cognate languages. Thus, the first, second, and fourth methods emerge as those preferable to determine a term's meaning (Kotzor 1985: 184, and Schwyter 1996: 36). This points very clearly towards the need to analyse every occurrence of the terms in our corpus in order to gather as much information as possible and hints at the problems arising in connection with those terms which are only attested once in the *OEC*.

In some cases (e.g. OE *taperex*), while the meaning of the term may be more or less clear, its association with a particular lexico-semantic field is not: axes were not commonly taken to war by the Anglo-Saxons, who preferred to use them as tools (Underwood 1999: 73), and accordingly, the term may be best discussed in connection with the terms referring to craft and trade; yet, axes were common weapons for the Viking-Age Scandinavians (Pedersen 2008: 205–06). Given that the term was not very common in Old English, as suggested by the fact that it is only recorded in three related contexts (see below, I.87), where neither fighting nor craftsmanship is discussed, and that the etymon is associated with fighting,<sup>3</sup> the loan is discussed in this book together with other terms referring to martial activities (cp. Hug 1987: 4).<sup>4</sup>

In any case, it seems clear that, amongst the content words, the technical terms are more numerous than the non-technical words and those associated with the legal world, martial activities, navigation, and social status are particularly prominent. Amongst the non-technical words, those associated with life, death, and existence, opinion and action, and temporal reference are most numerous. Function words are the least numerous. The differences between technical and non-technical vocabulary, between content and function words, and between the lexico-semantic fields represented in each register do not only lie in numbers, though. As the next section indicates, there also exists a difference with regard to the chronological and dialectal distribution of the terms.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Fischer translates the term as 'Streitax' ('battleaxe') (F. Fischer 1909: 45) and, similarly, Heggstad and others say that it is 'ei slags stridsøks' ('a type of battleaxe') (Heggstad and others 1997: s.v. *taperex*). Cf. Liberman 2005: 141, who discusses the etymon of OIc *tapar-* as referring to a tool rather than a weapon.

<sup>4</sup> The term could, of course, be discussed as well in connection with trading activities, weapons being one of the main trading goods during the Viking Age (see Hallinder 1986 and Martens 2004). On the problems involved in classifying terms into a given taxonomy, see further Kay 2000 and Kay 2004.



### 3.3. *Overview of the Chronological and Dialectal Distribution of the Norse-Derived Terms*

This section analyses the chronological and dialectal distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Old English texts. So as to study the chronological distribution of the terms, the texts where they are attested are divided into seven groups:

Group 1: texts which can be associated with a period up to the first half of the tenth century;

Group 2: texts which can be associated with the second half of the tenth century;

Group 3: texts whose date of composition is uncertain and which could be attributed either to the second half of the tenth century or to the first half of the eleventh century;

Group 4: texts which can be attributed to the first half of the eleventh century;

Group 5: texts whose date of composition is uncertain and which could be attributed to either the first or the second half of the eleventh century;

Group 6: texts which can be attributed to the second half of the eleventh century or later;

Group 7: texts whose dating is extremely problematic and fully uncertain.

Groups 3, 5, and 7 include texts which may have been composed at the turn of the period or at a date which cannot be established, i.e. they include texts which are likely to have been composed at quite different times; therefore, the information which they provide is not as reliable as that presented in the other groups.

In order to analyse the dialectal distribution of the terms, the texts are divided according to whether they can be associated with areas where the Scandinavian newcomers settled down or not (see above, 1.3.1). This association does not necessarily indicate that the text originates from those areas; the text may have been drafted in a linguistic context not associated with those areas but with those areas in mind (e.g. the *Law of Edward and Guthrum*; see below, II.257.15). As in the case of the chronological distribution of the texts, there are some texts which cannot be easily associated with either group; they are integrated in an intermediary group which, again, provides mixed and, therefore, less informative data.

Appendix II explains the reasons behind the integration of each text or group of texts in each chronological and dialectal group. We should not for-

get, though, that many texts are actually preserved in manuscripts from which they differ in terms of date and dialectal origin, and this casts some doubt as to whether the Norse-derived terms used in them are original or represent later lexical replacements in line with the scribes' lexical practices (cp. Gretsche 2004: 160, and van Houts 2004: 16; see also Dance 2000 and Dance forthcoming a). Some lexical changes have indeed been identified; they are explained at various points in the monograph (see below, 4.2 and Appendix II) and taken into consideration when assigning a text or a particular Norse-derived term to a chronological or dialectal group. In other cases, though, it is very difficult to determine whether there may have been lexical replacements or not, to a certain extent because, as shown by Benskin and Laing (Benskin and Laing 1981) and Dance (Dance forthcoming a), the same scribe might be inconsistent in his/her handling of the material in front of him/her, responses to the lexis in the exemplar being determined, amongst other factors, by 'where a scribe was in a copying stint', a familiar collocation, or simply taste for variety (Dance forthcoming a). Thus, we can only rely on the information available: e.g. the lexical choices in various witnesses of the same text, the presence or absence of clearly updated linguistic material, etc. When the date and dialectal origin of a text differ from those of the manuscript(s) where it is recorded, decisions have been made on an individual basis according to the evidence available. Generally speaking, though, unless there is significant evidence to the contrary, primacy has been given to the work rather than the manuscript because, otherwise, given the predominance of manuscripts produced in a limited number of scriptoria at the end of the Old English period, it may have been difficult to see any chronological or dialectal evolution. Yet it is important to bear this in mind because in some cases this decision may have led to inaccurate attributions. However, the advantages of trying to establish the dialectal and chronological distribution of the terms outnumber the possible problems arising from some misguided attributions, and that is the reason why this task is pursued in the present chapter.

When it is clearly the case that the occurrence of a term in a text has determined its occurrence in another, only the original context is included in the first table provided for each period. The original context and the derivative or related contexts are counted as one single item in the second table for each period; similarly, when the same term is used on various occasions in the same or related texts, it is only counted once. For a full list of all the occurrences of the Norse-derived terms in Old English texts, see Appendix I. The capital letters in the second table for each period refer to the classification of the Norse-derived terms into lexico-semantic fields provided above in Table 3.

3.3.1. Norse-Derived Terms Recorded in Group 1  
(i.e. Texts Dating from the First Half of the Tenth Century or Earlier)

Table 4. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 1.

Texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas	Texts of unknown origin	Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas
LawAGu: <i>healfmarc</i> , <i>lysing</i>	Brun: <i>cnearr</i> , <i>eorl</i> , and <i>nægledcnearr</i>	Ch 544 (Birch 883): <i>eorl</i>
LawNorðleod: <i>hold</i>	ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 915: <i>eorl</i>	ChronCom: <i>eorl</i> , <i>sumorlida</i> ChronCont1: <i>eorl</i> , <i>hold</i>

Table 5. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 1.

Texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas	Texts of unknown origin	Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas
E. <i>healfmarc</i> (1x)	F. <i>cnearr</i> (1x), <i>nægledcnearr</i> (1x)	C. <i>sumorlida</i> (1x) <sup>†</sup>
G. <i>hold</i> (1x), <i>lysing</i> (1x)	G. <i>eorl</i> (2x)	G. <i>eorl</i> (3x), <i>hold</i> (1x)

<sup>†</sup> The mid-tenth-century Cleopatra glossaries record OE *sumerlida* as a gloss for L *malleolus* ‘hammer-shaped slip; mallet-shoot for planting’ (CIGl (Stryker) 4196). However, this term should not be associated with the martial Norse-derived compound; it should rather be understood as belonging to the same word-field as the form ‘lideð’ (cp. OE *lēodan* ‘to spring up, grow’), which appears in the Paris Psalter in a context referring to the growth of trees (viz. MPs 91.11; see Meritt 1954: 114). Accordingly, the compound should be translated as ‘summer twig, shoot’.

These tables show that the first Norse-derived terms recorded in Old English texts are associated with the lexico-semantic fields of martial activities, navigation, monetary units, and social status, the areas where we would have expected the Anglo-Saxons to have particularly close contact with the Scandinavian newcomers: not only did the Anglo-Saxons fight with the Scandinavians after they arrived by sea, but they also entered into financial arrangements with them and, particularly, with their leaders. At this stage all the terms might refer specifically to the Scandinavian newcomers and their practices, i.e. they could still be described as cultural loans (cp. above, 2.1). Not surprisingly, this awareness of the other culture is reflected in an Anglo-Scandinavian treaty (viz. the *Law of Alfred and Guthrum*), where terminology belonging to the two sides is used (cp. Kershaw 2000: 48); this usage can, therefore, be compared with a much later interpolation in the 1016-annal of the D-text of the *Chronicle* referring to another Anglo-Scandinavian agreement where the two leaders entering into the agreement are referred to as ‘feolagan 7 wedbroðra’ (‘fellows and pledged brothers’) (see below, II.163.13).

### 3.3.2. Norse-Derived Terms Recorded in Group 2 (i.e. Texts Dating from the Second Half of the Tenth Century)

Table 6. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 2.

<b>Texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas</b>	<p>*Gl (Ru): <i>ār, ārlice, ōra</i></p> <p>* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl: <i>ār, ārlic, ārlice, ārmorgen, ārmorgenlic, brýðblōp, cost, dearf, dearflic, dearfscipe, efne, eggian, farnian, flēge, hold, ōra, saclēas, se(o)r[d/ð]an, song, ðir, ðræll(l)</i></p> <p>Ch 1377 (Rob 37): <i>ūtlaga / ūtlah</i></p> <p>Ch 1448 (Rob 39): <i>fēstermann, ōra, ðrefe</i></p> <p>LawIVEg: <i>eorl, lagu, wæpentac</i></p> <p>Rec 9.4 (Thorpe): <i>ōra</i></p>
<b>Texts of unknown origin</b>	LawHu: <i>ūtlaga / ūtlah</i>
<b>Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas</b>	<p>AldV *: <i>lagu</i></p> <p>Ch Æ: <i>cost</i></p> <p>Ch 659 (Birch 1029): <i>manslot</i></p> <p>LawIIEm: <i>grið, hāmsōcn</i></p> <p>OccGl 45.1.2 (Meritt): <i>cnearr</i></p>

Table 7. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 2.

<b>Texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas</b>	<p>B. <i>brýðblōp</i> (1x), <i>fēstermann</i> (1x), <i>lagu</i> (1x), <i>saclēas</i> (1x), <i>ūtlaga / ūtlah</i> (1x), <i>wæpentac</i> (1x)</p> <p>D. <i>ðrefe</i> (1x)</p> <p>E. <i>ōra</i> (4x)</p> <p>F. <i>flēge</i> (1x)</p> <p>G. <i>eorl</i> (1x), <i>hold</i> (1x), <i>ðir</i> (1x), <i>ðræll(l)</i> (1x)</p> <p>H. <i>eggian</i> (1x)</p> <p>J. <i>song</i> (1x)</p> <p>K. <i>cost</i> (1x), <i>dearf</i> (1x), <i>dearflic</i> (1x), <i>dearfscipe</i> (1x), <i>farnian</i> (1x)</p> <p>L. <i>efne</i> (1x)</p> <p>N. <i>se(o)r[d/ð]an</i> (1x)</p> <p>O. <i>ār</i> (2x), <i>ārlic</i> (1x), <i>ārlice</i> (2x), <i>ārmorgen</i> (1x), <i>ārmorgenlic</i> (1x)</p>
<b>Texts of unknown origin</b>	B. <i>ūtlaga / ūtlah</i> (1x)
<b>Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas</b>	<p>B. <i>cost</i> (1x), <i>grið</i> (1x), <i>hāmsōcn</i> (1x), <i>lagu</i> (1x)</p> <p>D. <i>manslot</i> (1x)</p> <p>F. <i>cnearr</i> (1x)</p>

The texts belonging to Group 2 show clear differences from those belonging to Group 1 in their use of Norse-derived vocabulary:

- (1) There is a significant increase in the amount of lexico-semantic fields represented by the terms, not only because of the introduction of non-technical terms (see below), but also because of the attestation of terms referring to previously unrepresented technical lexico-semantic fields, particularly legal issues and measurements. These new fields seem to imply a closer contact between the two cultures associated with the two languages, a contact partially associated with the settlement of the Scandinavian newcomers in England. Thus, Ch 659 (Birch 1029), a text whose drafting cannot be attributed to the Scandinavianized areas (see below, II.26), shows familiarity with the new terminology of land measurement and distribution applied after the Scandinavian settlement (cp. use of OE *toft*; see below, 3.3.3).
- (2) While in Group 1 we do not see a clear difference in the character of the Norse-derived terms recorded in texts associated with the Scandinavianized and non-Scandinavianized areas, a difference surfaces very clearly in Group 2: the texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas record only technical terms, whereas those associated with the Scandinavianized areas record both technical and non-technical terms.
- (3) The Norse-derived terms are no longer treated as cultural loans; they are being used without any specific association with the Scandinavian newcomers and their practices.

### 3.3.3. Norse-Derived Terms Recorded in Group 3 (i.e. Texts Dating either from the Second Half of the Tenth Century or the First Half of the Eleventh Century)

Table 8. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 3.

<b>Texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas</b>	<p>Ch <i>Æ</i>: <i>cost, eorl, formāl(a) / formæl, friðmāl, grið, healfmarc, hundred, lagu, lahcōp, landcōp, ōra, sac, saclēas, sammæle, scegðmann, ðræll(l), ðrinna, uncraflan, uncwyddian, ūtlaga / ūtlah, wæpentac</i></p> <p>Ch Peterbor (Rob 40): <i>eorl, feste, fēstermann, ōra, sticca, toft, ūtlagu, wæpentac, ġre / ēre</i></p> <p>Ch 1487 (Whitelock 13): <i>scegð</i></p> <p>Ch 1525 (Whitelock 37–38): <i>toft</i></p> <p>Ch 1659 (Rob 68): <i>eorl</i></p> <p>Ch 1660 (Rob 60): <i>eorl</i></p> <p>Inscr 1 (Ok 1): <i>hānum</i></p> <p>LawPax: <i>grið</i></p> <p>LawWal: <i>nīðing, walrēaf</i></p> <p>Rec 9.1 (RobApp II 9): <i>ōra</i></p>
<b>Texts of unknown origin</b>	<p>ChronD (Cubbin) 975: <i>eorl</i></p> <p>JDay II: <i>lagu</i></p> <p>LawBecwæð: <i>craflan, cwyddian, toft, unsac</i></p> <p>LawSwær: <i>formāl(a) / formæl</i></p> <p>Mald: <i>ceallian, dreng, eorl (?), † grið</i></p> <p>ProspGl: <i>lagu</i></p>
<b>Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas</b>	<p>ÆCorp: <i>cnīf, lagu, loft, scegðmann, ūtlaga / ūtlah, ūtlagian</i></p> <p>Ch <i>Æ</i>: <i>lagu, ūtlaga / ūtlah</i></p> <p>Ch 1455 (Rob 62): <i>sammæle</i></p> <p>ChrodR: <i>lagu</i></p> <p>Inscr 52 (Ok 138): <i>eorl (?), † fēolaga</i></p> <p>* (WSCp): <i>hūsbonða, lagu</i></p>

† Scholarly opinion is divided regarding whether OE *eorl* in *The Battle of Maldon* can be considered to act as a synonym of OE *ealdormann*, i.e. as a Norse-derived semantic loan (see below, 4.2.4).

‡ Although this text originates from a non-Scandinavianized area, it is likely to have been closely associated with the Scandinavian newcomers and, from that perspective, it could alternatively be placed in the column recording the texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see below, II.189). It is not clear whether OE *eorl* in this inscription is used as a common or a personal name (see Okasha 1971: no. 138, and Syrett 2002: 56).

Table 9. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 3.

<b>Texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas</b>	<p>B. <i>feste</i> (1x), <i>fēstermann</i> (1x), <i>formāl(a)</i> / <i>formæġl</i> (1x), <i>frīðmāl</i> (1x), <i>grīð</i> (2x), <i>lagu</i> (1x), <i>lahcōp</i> (1x), <i>landcōp</i> (1x), <i>nīðing</i> (1x), <i>sac</i> (1x), <i>saclēas</i> (1x), <i>sammæle</i> (1x), <i>uncrafian</i> (1x), <i>uncwyddian</i> (1x), <i>ūtlaga</i> / <i>ūtlah</i> (1x), <i>ūtlagu</i> (1x), <i>walrēaf</i> (1x), <i>wæpentac</i> (2x)</p> <p>D. <i>hundred</i> (1x), <i>sticca</i> (1x), <i>ðrinna</i> (1x)</p> <p>E. <i>bealfmarc</i> (1x), <i>ōra</i> (3x), <i>ȝre</i> / <i>ēre</i> (1x)</p> <p>F. <i>scegð</i> (1x), <i>scegðmann</i> (1x)</p> <p>G. <i>eorl</i> (4x), <i>ðræġl(l)</i> (1x)</p> <p>J. <i>toft</i> (2x)</p> <p>K. <i>cost</i> (1x)</p> <p>P. <i>hānum</i> (1x)</p>
<b>Texts of unknown origin</b>	<p>B. <i>crafian</i> (1x), <i>cwyddian</i> (1x), <i>formāl(a)</i> / <i>formæġl</i> (1x), <i>grīð</i> (1x), <i>lagu</i> (2x), <i>unsac</i> (1x)</p> <p>C. <i>dreng</i> (1x)</p> <p>G. <i>eorl</i> (1x?)<sup>†</sup></p> <p>H. <i>ceallian</i> (1x)</p> <p>J. <i>toft</i> (1x)</p>
<b>Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas</b>	<p>A. <i>cnīf</i> (1x)</p> <p>B. <i>fēolaga</i> (1x), <i>lagu</i> (4x), <i>sammæle</i> (1x), <i>ūtlaga</i> / <i>ūtlah</i> (2x), <i>ūtlagian</i> (1x)</p> <p>F. <i>scegðmann</i> (1x)</p> <p>G. <i>eorl</i> (1x?),<sup>‡</sup> <i>hūsbōnda</i> (1x)</p> <p>L. <i>loft</i> (1x)</p>

<sup>†</sup> See the first footnote to Table 8, opposite.<sup>‡</sup> See the second footnote to Table 8 opposite.

Group 3 shares many of the trends already present in Group 2: e.g. amongst the technical vocabulary, the Norse-derived terms are well-integrated into the legal language, while the monetary terms of Norse origin remain solely associated with the Scandinavianized areas. We also see a continuation in the use of terms referring to land distribution and settlement; in fact, OE *toft* is already attested (as a place-name formative, not as a common noun) in Ch 712 (Birch 1112) 4, a text recording a grant of lands in Yorkshire by King Edgar which is dated to 963 by the *Electronic Sawyer* (no. 712).



The most important differences between this group and Group 2 are, on the one hand, the presence of non-technical Norse-derived vocabulary in texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas, a trend which increases through the eleventh century and reaches its peak in the Middle English period; and, on the other hand, the use of Norse-derived function words in texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas, which, again, increases particularly towards the end of the period covered by this study (see below, 3.3.6) and the Middle English period. On the significance of the use of these terms, see above, 3.2.1–2.

### 3.3.4. Norse-Derived Terms Recorded in Group 4 (i.e. Texts Dating from the First Half of the Eleventh Century)

Table 10. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 4.

<b>Texts associated with the Scan- dinavianized areas</b>	ByrM 1 (Baker/Lapidge): <i>lagu</i>
	Ch Cn: <i>plögesland, toft</i>
	Ch 1468 (Rob 97): <i>marc</i>
	Ch 1490 (Whitelock 28): <i>marc</i>
	Ch 1521 (Whitelock 29): <i>marc</i>
	Ch 1527 (Whitelock 24): <i>toft, fra / fro</i>
	Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31): <i>brynige, eorl, sadolfæt, fēolaga, fēolagscipe, healfmarc, mǣldæg, marc, mund, toft</i>
	Ch 1537 (Whitelock 27): <i>brynige, goldwrecen, marc, ōra</i>
	LawNorgrið: <i>cyricgrið, grið, hundred, lagu</i>
	Rec 24.1 (Rob 84): <i>plögesland</i>
	WCorp: <i>eorl, lahslite, ōra</i>
<b>Texts of unknown origin</b>	AnHexa: <i>fra / fro, hūsbōnda, lagu</i>
	ChronÆC: <i>eorl, grið, griðian, hūsting, sammæle, scegð, ūtlaga / ūtlah, ūtlagian</i>
	ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1030: <i>eorl</i>
	ChronE (Irvine) 1023–41: <i>eorl, grið, holm, liðsmann, marc</i>
	HomM 15 (Wanley): <i>lagu</i>
	HomU 46 (Nap 57): <i>lagu, ūtlaga / ūtlah</i>
	LawRect: <i>lagu, landlagu, ðegnlagu</i>
	LawWif: <i>sammæle</i>
	PrudGl 1 (Meritt): <i>ælagol, burhlagu, lagu</i>

Table 10. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 4. (*cont.*)

<b>Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas</b>	AldV *:† <i>grīðian, lagu, scegð, ütlaða / ütlað</i>
	AntGl * (Kindschi): <i>barð, barða, eorl, scegð</i>
	BenRGl: <i>lagu</i>
	BoGl (Hale): <i>grīð</i>
	Ch Cn: <i>eorl, grīðbryce, hāmsōcn, hūscarl, lagu, {saclēas},‡ unlagu, woruldlagu</i>
	Ch ECf: <i>eorl, grīðbryce, hāmsōcn, lagu</i>
	Ch 898 (Kem 705): <i>toft</i>
	Ch 1389 (Rob 89): <i>eorl, marc</i>
	Ch 1391 (Rob 98): <i>eorl</i>
	Ch 1394 (Rob 94): <i>eorl</i>
	Ch 1465 (Rob 86): <i>hūsting, marc</i>
	Ch 1469 (Rob 99): <i>eorl, ōra, healfmarc</i>
	Ch 1471 (Rob 101): <i>eorl</i>
	Ch 1472 (Rob 102): <i>eorl</i>
	Ch 1473 (Rob 103): <i>marc</i>
	Ch 1474 (Rob 105): <i>eorl</i>
	Ch 1492 (Nap-Steven 10): <i>hā?, scegð</i>
	Ch 1530 (Whitelock 30): <i>eorl</i>
	ChronAbing: <i>eorl, grīð, hamele, hūscarl, gersum(a), marc, ütlagian</i>
	ChronD (Cubbin) 1023: <i>eorl</i>
	HIgl (Oliphant): <i>lagu</i>
	HomU 27 (Nap 30): <i>lagu</i>
	HomU 32 (Nap 40) + HomU 34 (Nap 42): <i>lagu</i>
	HyGl 2 (Milfull) <i>ūtlaða / ütlað</i>
	Rec 23.4 (Ker): <i>ōra</i>
	RegCgl (Kornexl): <i>lahlice</i>
	WCorp: <i>bōnda, cost, cyricrēn, cyricgrīð, drincelēan, eorl, eorldōm, eorlgyfu, eorhriht, folclagu, frið, friðlēas, grīð, grīðian, grīðbryce, grīðlagu, grīðlēas, hādgrīð, hāelnesgrīð, hāmsōcn, handgrīð, inlagian, lagian, lagu, lahbryce, lahlic, lahlice, lahriht, lahslite, lahswita, lahgewrit, mæglagu, nām, regollagu, rihtlagu, ðegnlagu, ðræll(l), ðrælhriht, unlagu, unsac, ütlaða / ütlað, woruldlagu</i>

† On the presence of OE *māl* 'suit, case, agreement' in AldV 1 (Goossens) 3701 (= AldV 13.1 [Nap] 3815), see Pons-Sanz 2006c.

‡ {} indicate that the term is only recorded in spurious or otherwise problematic charters attributed to a king (see Appendix II). Cp. Ch 951 (Davidson).

Table 11. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 4.

<b>Texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas</b>	A. <i>goldwrecen</i> (1x)
	B. <i>cyricgrið</i> (1x), <i>fēolaga</i> (1x), <i>fēolagscipe</i> (1x), <i>grið</i> (1x), <sup>†</sup> <i>lagu</i> (2x), <i>lahslite</i> (1x), <i>māldæg</i> (1x), <i>mund</i> (1x)
	C. <i>brynige</i> (2x)
	D. <i>hundred</i> (1x), <i>plōgesland</i> (2x)
	E. <i>healfmarc</i> (1x), <i>marc</i> (5x), <i>ōra</i> (2x)
	G. <i>eorl</i> (1x)
	J. <i>toft</i> (3x)
	M. <i>sadolfæt</i> (1x)
	P. <i>fra</i> / <i>fro</i> (1x)
<b>Texts of unknown origin</b>	B. <i>cēlagol</i> (1x), <i>burhlagu</i> (1x), <i>grið</i> (1x), <i>griðian</i> (1x), <i>hūsting</i> (1x), <i>lagu</i> (5x), <i>landlagu</i> (1x), <i>sammāele</i> (1x), <i>ðegnlagu</i> (1x), <i>ūtlaga</i> / <i>ūtlah</i> (2x), <i>ūtlagian</i> (1x)
	C. <i>liðsmann</i> (1x)
	E. <i>marc</i> (1x)
	F. <i>scegð</i> (1x)
	G. <i>eorl</i> (3x), <i>hūsbonða</i> (1x)
	L. <i>holm</i> (1x)
	P. <i>fra</i> / <i>fro</i> (1x)
<b>Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas</b>	B. <i>cost</i> (1x), <i>cyricrēn</i> (1x), <i>cyricgrið</i> (1x), <i>drincelēan</i> (1x), <i>folclagu</i> (1x), <i>frið</i> (1x), <i>friðlēas</i> (1x), <i>grið</i> (3x), <i>griðbryce</i> (3x), <i>griðian</i> (2x), <i>griðlagu</i> (1x), <i>griðlēas</i> (1x), <i>hādgrīð</i> (1x), <i>hælnesgrið</i> (1x), <i>hāmsōcn</i> (3x), <i>handgrið</i> (1x), <i>hūsting</i> (1x), <i>inlagian</i> (1x), <i>lagian</i> (1x), <i>lagu</i> (8x), <i>labbryce</i> (1x), <i>lablic</i> (1x), <i>lablice</i> (2x), <i>labriht</i> (1x), <i>lahslite</i> (1x), <i>lahwita</i> (1x), <i>labgewrit</i> (1x), <i>māēlagu</i> (1x), <i>nām</i> (1x), <i>regollagu</i> (1x), <i>rihtlagu</i> (1x), <i>ðegnlagu</i> (1x), <i>unlagu</i> (2x), <i>unsac</i> (1x), <i>ūtlaga</i> / <i>ūtlah</i> (3x), <i>ūtlagian</i> (1x), <i>woruldlagu</i> (2x)
	E. <i>healfmarc</i> (1x), <i>marc</i> (4x), <i>ōra</i> (2x)
	F. <i>barð</i> (1x), <i>barða</i> (1x), <i>hā</i> (1x?), <i>hamele</i> (1x), <i>scegð</i> (3x)
	G. <i>bōnda</i> (1x), <i>eorl</i> (14x), <i>eorlgyfu</i> (1x), <i>eorldōm</i> (1x), <i>eorlriht</i> (1x), <i>hūscahl</i> (2x), <i>ðræcl</i> (l) (1x), <i>ðræclriht</i> (1x)
	J. <i>toft</i> (1x)
	M. <i>gersum(a)</i> (1x)

<sup>†</sup> See also below, III.1.8.A.

The terms recorded in Group 4 follow, in general, the same trends as those in Groups 2 and 3. The most significant difference is the fact that the monetary terms OE (*healf*)*marc* and *ōra* have started to be used as well in texts associated

with the non-Scandinavianized areas, whereas previous textual groups only record them in connection with the Scandinavian newcomers and the areas where they settled down (on this change, see further below, 3.4.2.4.A). It is also notable that the preposition OE *fria* / *fro* is already recorded in this chronological group in texts which are not clearly associated with the Scandinavianized areas. As pointed out above, 2.2.2.6, the attestation of this preposition in the anonymous translation of Genesis is problematic, but, if it indeed represents the Norse-derived term, its quick spread outside the Scandinavianized areas could be explained as a result of the similarity between the Old English preposition and its Old Norse cognate.

### 3.3.5 Norse-Derived Terms Recorded in Group 5 (i.e. Texts Dating either from the First or the Second Half of the Eleventh Century)

Table 12. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 5.

<b>Texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas</b>	Ch ECf: <i>griðbryce, hāmsōcn</i>
	Ch 1489 (Whitelock 26): <i>marc</i>
	Ch 1499 (Whitelock 35): <i>marc</i>
	Inscr 22 (Ok 64): <i>sōlmerca</i>
	LawNorthu: <i>cyricgrið, fēstermann, healfmarc, lagu, lahslit, prēostlagu, wæpentac</i>
	Rec 24.4 (Stevenson): <i>fēstermann</i>
<b>Texts of unknown origin</b>	Ch 1535 (Whitelock 32): <i>eorl</i>
	HomS 30 (TristrApp 2): <i>lēst</i>
	HomU 59 (Nap 37): <i>lagu</i>
	LawDuns: <i>lahmann</i>
	Prog 5.1 (Warn): <i>grið</i>
<b>Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas</b>	ÆColl: <i>ðræðl(l)</i>
	ArPrGl 1 (Holt-Campb): <i>lagu</i>
	Ch ECf: <i>hūscarl, eorl, griðbryce, hāmsōcn, lagu</i>
	Ch 959 (Rob 82): <i>taperæx</i>
	Ch 1403 (Rob 107): <i>eorl</i>
	Charm 12.2 (Storms): <i>cnīf</i>
	ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63 (annals 1043b–48): <i>bōnda, eorl, gersum(a), grið, griðian, hūsbōnda, liðsmann, ūtlaga / ūtlah</i>
	Lit 5.12.2: <i>fīa / fro</i>
	LibSc + IsidSent (Cornelius): <i>lagu, labbreca, labbrecende, lablic</i>
	Rec 15 (Birch 106): <i>gersum(a)</i>

Table 13. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 5.

<b>Texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas</b>	B. <i>cyricgrið</i> (1x), <i>fēstermann</i> (2x), <i>griðbryce</i> (1x), <sup>15</sup> <i>hāmsōcn</i> (1x), <i>lahslite</i> (1x), <i>lagu</i> (1x), <i>prēostlagu</i> (1x), <i>wæpentac</i> (1x) E. <i>healfmarc</i> (1x), <i>marc</i> (2x) L. <i>sölmerca</i> (1x)
<b>Texts of unknown origin</b>	B. <i>grið</i> (1x), <i>lagu</i> (1x), <i>lahmann</i> (1x) G. <i>eorl</i> (1x) K. <i>lest</i> (1x)
<b>Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas</b>	A. <i>cnīf</i> (1x) B. <i>grið</i> (1x), <i>griðbryce</i> (1x), <i>griðian</i> (1x), <i>hāmsōcn</i> (1x), <i>lagu</i> (3x), <i>lahbreca</i> (1x), <i>lahbrecende</i> (1x), <i>lahlic</i> (1x), <i>ūtlaga</i> / <i>ūtlah</i> (1x) C. <i>liðsmann</i> (1x), <i>taperex</i> (1x) G. <i>bōnda</i> (1x), <i>eorl</i> (3x), <i>hūs bōnda</i> (1x), <i>hūscarl</i> (1x), <i>ðræġel(l)</i> (1x) M. <i>gæsum(a)</i> (2x) P. <i>fra</i> / <i>fro</i> (1x)

† On the possible attestation of OE *grið* in a set of glosses recorded in a mid-eleventh-century Peterborough manuscript, see below, III.1.8.A.

The texts in this group show a continuation of the trends already exemplified by the previous textual groups.

### 3.3.6. Norse-Derived Terms Recorded in Group 6 (i.e. Texts Dating from the Second Half of the Eleventh Century or Later)

Table 14. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 6.

<b>Texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas</b>	Ch ECF: { <i>dearf</i> }, <i>eorl</i> , <i>fra</i> / <i>fro</i> , { <i>grid</i> }, <i>gridbryce</i> , <i>hāmsōcn</i> , <i>lagu</i> , { <i>saclēas</i> }, <i>unlagu</i>
	Ch Ulf (Whitelock 39): <i>marc</i>
	Ch IWm: <i>caupland</i> , <i>dearf</i> , <i>eorl</i> , <i>orrest</i> , { <i>uncrafian</i> }, { <i>uncwyddian</i> }, <i>wæpentac</i>
	Ch 1519 (Whitelock 34): <i>brynige</i> , <i>eorl</i> , <i>fēolagscipe</i> , <i>marc</i>
	Ch 1529 (Whitelock 36): <i>lysing</i>
	ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: <i>band</i> , <i>bāde</i> , <i>bōndeland</i> , <i>eorl</i> , <i>eorldōm</i> , <i>fra</i> / <i>fro</i> , <i>fraward</i> , <i>fyrre(r)</i> , <i>gæsum(a)</i> , <i>gēatan</i> , <i>grid</i> , <i>gridian</i> , <i>hūscarl</i> , <i>lagu</i> , <i>marc</i> , <i>rennan</i> , <i>rōtfest</i> , <i>sahltian</i> , <i>sahtnes</i> , <i>sandermann</i> , <i>swegen</i> , <i>tacan</i> ( <i>wið</i> ), <i>ðorp</i> , <i>unsah</i> ( <i>n</i> ), <i>ūtlaga</i> / <i>ūtlah</i>
	ChronNor2: <i>brýðhlōp</i> , <sup>†</sup> <i>eorl</i> , <i>eorldōm</i> , <i>gæsum(a)</i> , <i>grāscinnen</i> , <i>grid</i> , <i>gridian</i> , <i>healdan</i> , <i>hearmascinnen</i> , <i>hlēapan</i> <i>ūt</i> , <i>hofding</i> , <i>hyttan</i> , <i>lagian</i> , <i>lið</i> , <i>norren</i> , <i>scinn</i> , <i>tacan</i> , <i>ūtlagian</i> , <i>wæð</i>
	Inscr 22 (Ok 64): <i>eorl</i>
	Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8): <i>ælding</i> , <i>ærfle</i> , <i>fyrre(r)</i> , <i>healfmarc</i> , <i>marc</i> , <i>ōra</i> , <i>ȝre</i> / <i>ēre</i>
	Rec 5.4 (Rob 104): <i>manslot</i> , <i>ōra</i> , <i>sceppe</i> , <i>scoru</i>
	Rec 8.2 (RobApp I 2): <i>māl</i>
<b>Texts of unknown origin</b>	ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: <i>carlmann</i> , <i>eorl</i> , <i>eorldōm</i> , <i>gæsum(a)</i> , <i>grid</i> , <i>gridian</i> , <i>healdan</i> , <sup>‡</sup> <i>inlagian</i> , <i>lagu</i> , <i>lið</i> , <i>māl</i> , <i>marc</i> , <i>orrest</i> , <i>saclēas</i> , <i>sah</i> ( <i>n</i> ), <i>sah</i> ( <i>e</i> ) ( <i>a</i> ), <i>sahltian</i> , <i>stōr</i> , <i>unlagagiæld</i> , <i>unlagu</i> , <i>unniðing</i>
	HomU 17: <i>carlfugol</i> , <i>cwenfugol</i>
	LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): <i>gecrōcod</i> , <i>dearflice</i> , <i>eorl</i> , <i>gæsum(a)</i> , <i>gestning</i> , <i>grid</i> , <i>hyttan</i> , <i>lagu</i> , <i>ofiacan</i> , <i>rōt</i> , <i>tacan</i> ( <i>on</i> ), <i>ūtlaga</i> / <i>ūtlah</i>
	LS 28 (Neot): <i>lagu</i>
	OccGl 28 (Nap): <i>lagu</i>
	Rec 26.4 (RobApp I 3): <i>eorl</i>
<b>Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas</b>	AldV *: <i>healsbrynigeð</i>
	Ch ECF: { <i>grid</i> }, <i>gridbryce</i> , <i>eorl</i> , <i>hāmsōcn</i> , <i>hūscarl</i> , { <i>lagu</i> }, { <i>saclēas</i> }, { <i>ungrid</i> }, <i>unlagu</i>
	Ch IHen: <i>eorl</i> , <i>lagu</i> , <i>saclēas</i>
	Ch IWm: <i>dearf</i> , <i>eorl</i> , <i>gridbryce</i> , <i>hāmsōcn</i> , <i>lagu</i> , <i>lahlic</i> , <i>unlagu</i> , <i>ūtlagu</i>
	Ch IIWm (PRO1906): <i>gridbryce</i> , <i>hāmsōcn</i>



Table 14. Textual distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 6. (*cont.*)

<b>Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas (<i>cont.</i>)</b>	Ch Lambourn (RobAppl 5): <i>saclēas</i> , <i>scēr</i>
	Ch Taunton (RobAppl 4): <i>grīðbryce</i> , <i>hāmsōcn</i>
	Ch Odo (Loyd-Stenton): <i>eorl</i>
	Ch 255 (Birch 1331–33): <i>fīa</i> / <i>fro</i>
	Ch 783 (Birch 1277): <i>grīðbryce</i> , <i>hāmsōcn</i>
	Ch 1232 (Rob 113): <i>eorl</i>
	Ch 1406 (Rob 112): <i>eorl</i>
	Ch 1409 (Rob 111): <i>eorl</i>
	Ch 1426 (Rob 117): <i>eorl</i> , <i>marc</i>
	Ch 1476 (Rob 114): <i>eorl</i> , <i>gæsum(a)</i>
	Ch 1478 (Rob 115): <i>eorl</i> , <i>hūscarl</i>
	ChronA (Bately) 1053: <i>eorl</i>
	ChronA (Bately) 1066: <i>eorl</i>
	ChronAbing: <i>būtsecarl</i> , <i>eorl</i> , <i>eorldōm</i> , <i>gæsum(a)</i> , <i>grīð</i> , <i>grīðian</i> , <i>healdan</i> , <i>hūscarl</i> , <i>inlagian</i> , <i>lagu</i> , <i>lið</i> , <i>liðsmann</i> , ( <i>scylan of</i> ) <i>māl</i> , <i>nīðing</i> , <i>sciplið</i> , <i>unlagu</i> , <i>ūtlagian</i>
	ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63 (annals 1049–63): <i>eorl</i> , <i>eorldōm</i> , <i>hāsæta</i> , <i>lið</i> , ( <i>beran ūp</i> ) <i>māl</i> , <i>ūtlaga</i> / <i>ūtlah</i>
	ChronF (Baker): <i>eorl</i> , <i>gæsum(a)</i> , <i>grīðian</i> , <i>lagian</i> (?) <sup>††</sup>
	ChronWorc: <i>eorl</i> , <i>eorldōm</i> , <i>fēolaga</i> , <i>grīð</i> , <i>grīðian</i> , <i>hūscarl</i> , <i>gæsum(a)</i> , <i>lagu</i> , <i>marc</i> , <i>ūtlagian</i> , <i>ūtlaga</i> / <i>ūtlah</i> , ( <i>cuman tō</i> ) <i>wīðermāl(e)</i>
	Rec 2.3 (Earle): <i>ōna</i> , <i>yre</i> / <i>ēre</i>
	Rec 4 (Först): <i>saclēas</i>
	Rec 10.1 (RobApp I 1): <i>gæsum(a)</i> , <i>scinn</i> , <i>unlagu</i>
	Rec 10.2 (Hickes): <i>bōnda</i>
	Rec 10.6.2 (Dickins-Earle) *: <i>crafian</i> , <sup>††</sup> <i>saclēas</i>
	Rec 23.3 (RobApp I 6): <i>healfmarc</i> , <i>marc</i>
	StWulf: <i>eorl</i>

<sup>†</sup> On the likely association of OE *brýðblōp* (ChronD (Cubbin) 1076), *hofðing* (ChronD (Cubbin) 1076), *hyttan* (ChronD (Cubbin) 1066), *tacan* (ChronD (Cubbin) 1072, 1075, and 1076), and *wæð* (ChronD (Cubbin) 1073) with these annals, see below, 4.2.1.

<sup>†</sup> On the likely association of OE *healdan* in ChronE (Irvine) 1075, *inlagian* in ChronE (Irvine) 1074, and *lið* in ChronE (Irvine) 1069 with these annals, see below, 4.2.1.

<sup>§</sup> OE *healsbeorg* ‘neck armour’ renders the same lemma, viz. L *thoraca* ‘corselet, breastplate’, in AldV 1 (Goossens) 4904 = AldV 13.1 (Nap) 5021.

<sup>††</sup> See Baker 2000: 90 n. 9 for the possibility that the verb is actually OE *lōgian* ‘to put in place, arrange’.

<sup>††</sup> On OE *crafian* in Rec 10.6.2 (Dickins-Earle) 8.1, see above, note 134 in Chapter 2.

Table 15. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 6.

<b>Texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas</b>	A. <i>gräsinnen</i> (1x), <i>hearmascinnen</i> (1x), <i>scinn</i> (1x)
	B. <i>brýðhlöp</i> (1x), <i>caupland</i> (1x), <i>feolagscipe</i> (1x), <i>gēatan</i> (1x), <i>grīð</i> (2x + {1x}), <i>grīðbryce</i> (1x), <i>grīðian</i> (2x), <i>hāmsōcn</i> (1x), <i>hlēapan út</i> (1x), <i>lagu</i> (2x), <i>māl</i> (1x), <i>orrest</i> (1x), { <i>saclēas</i> , (1x)}, <i>sahltian</i> (1x), <i>sahtnes</i> (1x), { <i>uncrafian</i> (1x)}, { <i>uncwyddian</i> (1x)}, <i>unlagu</i> (1x), <i>unsahť</i> (n.) (1x), <i>útlaga</i> / <i>útlah</i> (1x), <i>útlagian</i> (1x), <i>wæpentac</i> (1x)
	C. <i>brynige</i> (1x), <i>lið</i> (1x)
	D. <i>manslot</i> (1x), <i>sceppe</i> (1x), <i>scoru</i> (1x)
	E. <i>healfmarc</i> (1x), <i>marc</i> (4x), <i>ōra</i> (2x), <i>ȝre</i> / <i>ēre</i> (1x)
	F. <i>healdan</i> (1x)
	G. <i>bōndeland</i> (1x), <i>eorl</i> (6x), <i>eorldōm</i> (2x), <i>hofding</i> (1x), <i>hūscarl</i> (1x), <i>lȝsing</i> (1x)
	I. <i>ærfle</i> (1x), <i>band</i> , (1x), <i>norren</i> (1x), <i>rennan</i> (1x), <i>rōtfest</i> (1x), <i>swegen</i> (1x)
	J. <i>ǣlding</i> (1x), <i>ðorp</i> (1x)
	K. <i>dearf</i> (1x + {1x})
	L. <i>wæð</i> (1x)
	M. <i>gersum(a)</i> (2x), <i>gēatan</i> (1x), <i>tacan (wið)</i> (2x)
	N. <i>hyttan</i> (1x), <i>sandermann</i> (1x)
	O. <i>fyrre(r)</i> (1x)
	P. <i>bāðe</i> (1x), <i>fra</i> / <i>fro</i> (2x), <i>fraward</i> (1x)
<b>Texts of unknown origin</b>	B. <i>grīð</i> (2x), <i>grīðian</i> (1x), <i>inlagian</i> (1x), <i>lagu</i> (4x), <i>māl</i> (1x), <i>orrest</i> (1x), <i>saclēas</i> (1x), <i>sahť</i> , n. (?) (1x), <i>sahť(e)</i> , a. (?) (1x), <i>sahltian</i> (?) (1x), <i>unlagu</i> (1x), <i>unnīðing</i> (1x), <i>útlaga</i> / <i>útlah</i> (1x)
	C. <i>lið</i> (1x)
	E. <i>marc</i> (1x)
	F. <i>healdan</i> (1x)
	G. <i>eorl</i> (3x), <i>eorldōm</i> (1x)
	I. <i>carlfugol</i> (1x), <i>carlmann</i> (1x), <i>gecrōcod</i> (1x), <i>cwenfugol</i> (1x), <i>rōť</i> (1x), <i>stōr</i> (1x), <i>tacan on</i> (1x)
	K. <i>dearflice</i> (1x)
	M. <i>gersum(a)</i> (2x)
	N. <i>gestning</i> (1x), <i>hyttan</i> (1x), <i>oftacan</i> (1x)

Table 15. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 6. (*cont.*)

<b>Texts associated with the non- Scandinavianized areas</b>	A. <i>scinn</i> (1x)
	B. <i>fēolaga</i> (1x), <i>craſian</i> (1x), <i>gæsum(a)</i> (1x), <i>grið</i> (2x + {1x}), <i>gridbryce</i> (5x), <i>gridian</i> (3x), <i>hāmsōcn</i> (5x), <i>inlagian</i> (1x), <i>lahlic</i> (1x), <i>lagian</i> (1x?), <i>lagu</i> (4x + {1x}), <i>māl</i> (2x: <i>beran up māl</i> , 1x; <i>scylian of male</i> , 1x), <i>nīðing</i> (1x), <i>saclēas</i> (4x + {1x}), <i>scēr</i> (1x), { <i>ungrið</i> (1x)}, <i>unlagu</i> (4x), <i>ūtlagian</i> (1x), <i>ūtlaga</i> / <i>ūtlah</i> (2x), <i>ūtlagu</i> (1x), ( <i>cuman tō</i> ) <i>wīðermāl</i> (1x)
	C. <i>būtsecarl</i> (1x), <i>hāsæta</i> (1x), <i>healsbrynige</i> (1x), <i>lið</i> (2x), <i>liðsmann</i> (1x), <i>sciplið</i> (1x)
	E. <i>healfmarc</i> (1x), <i>marc</i> (3x), <i>ōra</i> (1x), <i>ȝre</i> / <i>ēre</i> (1x)
	F. <i>healdan</i> (1x)
	G. <i>bōnda</i> (1x), <i>eorl</i> (17x), <i>eorldōm</i> (2x), <i>hūscarl</i> (4x)
	K. <i>dearf</i> (1x)
	M. <i>gæsum(a)</i> (4x)
	P. <i>fra</i> / <i>fro</i> (1x)

Besides the sheer amount of Norse-derived terms in these late Old English texts, the most remarkable trend in this group is the significant presence of function words in a text associated with the Scandinavianized areas; this is a trend which is already present in earlier texts (see above, 3.3.3), but which only becomes significant in late Old English and Middle English texts (see also below, 3.3.7 and Appendix IV).

### 3.3.7. Norse-Derived Terms Recorded in Group 7 (i.e. Texts from a Fully Uncertain Date)

Table 16. Textual distribution of Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 7.

<b>Texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas</b>	—
<b>Texts of unknown origin</b>	Med 5.8 (Cockayne): <i>rōt</i> Scrib 3.1 (Ker): <i>hæil</i> , <i>ōc</i> ? LawOrdal: <i>lagu</i>
<b>Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas</b>	—

Table 17. Lexico-semantic distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Group 7.

<b>Texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas</b>	—
<b>Texts of unknown origin</b>	B. <i>lagu</i> (1x) I. <i>hæil</i> (1x), <i>rōt</i> (1x) P. <i>ōc</i> (1x?)
<b>Texts associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas</b>	—

If OE *ōc* is indeed Norse-derived, and if it is associated with the other function words in the corpus, its presence in the scribble may be indicative of the latter's late date and its possible association with the Scandinavian newcomers. However, any suggestion in this respect has to remain purely speculative (see below, II.255).

### 3.3.8. Conclusion

This section has analysed the chronological and dialectal distribution of the lexico-semantic fields where the Norse-derived terms recorded in Old English texts are integrated, as well as distribution of the few function words attested during the Old English period. It shows that the lexical results of the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact generally agree with the theoretical expectations: while only technical terms are recorded at first (Group 1; see above, 3.3.1), non-technical terms soon start to crop up in texts produced in the Scandinavianized areas (Group 2; see above, 3.3.2). The use of these terms might be attributable to a combination of borrowing and imposition, while the use of some technical and non-technical vocabulary in the non-Scandina-

vianized areas could be the result of interdialectal contact (see Group 3; see above, 3.3.3). As expected, function words are in the main restricted to late Old English texts produced in the Scandinavianized areas, which might be a further insight into the effects of imposition (see above, 3.3.3–6); the main possible exception is the presence of OE *fra* / *fro* in texts originating from outside the areas settled by the Scandinavian newcomers, although this is neither unproblematic nor particularly difficult to account for (see above, 2.2.2.6).

### *3.4. The Norse-Derived Terms in their Lexico-Semantic Fields*

#### **3.4.1. Initial Theoretical Remarks**

The rest of this chapter aims to study the Norse-derived terms as members of their lexico-semantic fields by analysing the semantic and stylistic relationships between them and their (near)synonymous native terms. We should remember that it is almost impossible for two terms to be full synonyms because, as Horobin points out, ‘words have numerous associations: stylistic, sociolinguistic, dialectal, generational, figurative and metaphorical, which allow us to make fine-grained distinctions between members of the [lexico-semantic] field’ (Horobin 2009: 96). Unfortunately, though, the extant Old English records do not always allow us to make as ‘fine-grained distinctions’ as we would like to.

Analysing the semantic and stylistic relationships between the Norse-derived terms and their native equivalents is fundamental in order to gain a better understanding of the reasons that may have led an author to use a Norse-derived term in a particular context. These reasons are likely to be closely associated with what we know about the chronological and dialectal distribution of the terms; thus, all these factors (viz. the chronological and dialectal distribution of a specific term, the semantic and stylistic relationships between (near) synonyms, and the possible reasons for the use of a Norse-derived term in a text) are discussed together in connection with each term or group of terms.<sup>5</sup>

The native (near)synonyms are generally identified with the help of the *TOE*. Due to spatial limitations, those terms which are only attested in one work or in a group of works which are attributable to a single author are in the main analysed only in connection with the native alternatives which are recorded in the same work(s). In discussions on the various members of a par-

<sup>5</sup> On the difficulties involved in gathering all these types of information, see above, 3.2.2 and 3.3.

ticular lexico-semantic field, the reader will frequently encounter references to a term's apparent use as a core or peripheral member of the field. Such judgments are closely associated with scholarly debates (frequently in connection with issues of language acquisition) of the so-called *core* or *nuclear vocabulary* (see Stubbs 1986: 99, with references, and Carter 1987). Carter (Carter 1982 and Carter 1998: ch. 2) presents a very useful set of criteria that should be considered when trying to establish the coreness of the members of particular lexico-semantic fields (cp. Stubbs 1986: ch. 6):

- (1) Core terms are generally used to define peripheral terms, but cannot be easily defined by peripheral terms (e.g. PDE *to dine* can be defined by referring to PDE *to eat*, but the opposite is not true).<sup>6</sup> Accordingly, core members tend to be superordinates rather than hyponyms, although it is not the case that all superordinates will be core terms because, in some cases, the hyponyms are actually the unmarked terms.<sup>7</sup> Similarly, core terms tend to be used in summaries more often than peripheral terms.
- (2) It is easier to find antonyms for core terms than for peripheral terms (e.g. whereas the antonym of PDE *fat* is PDE *thin*, it is not as easy to establish what the antonym of PDE *plump* may be).
- (3) The more core a term is, the wider collocational patterns it will be used in. This is also an indication that core terms tend to be polysemous.
- (4) Core members tend to participate in processes of word-formation much more frequently than peripheral members and, hence, are part of large word-fields.

<sup>6</sup> This statement is clearly connected with the concept of prototypicality, one of the key aspects of the semasiological approach to cognitive semantics: 'prototypical status is usually assigned to that category member whose configuration of defining features is not only attested the most (i.e. has the highest frequency) in a sufficiently large database, but also whose feature configuration combines the highest number of dominant features' (Grondelaers and Geeraerts 2003: 72). On the difference between semasiology and onomasiology, see Grondelaers and Geeraerts 2003: 69; on the limitations of prototype theory, see, for instance, Croft and Cruse 2004: 87–91.

<sup>7</sup> The relationship between superordinates and hyponyms can be associated with the basic level hypothesis of the onomasiological approach to cognitive semantics. According to Geeraerts and others, 'the basic level [in a taxonomy] embodies a set of naming preferences: given a particular referent, the most likely name for that referent from among the alternatives provided by the taxonomy will be the name situated at the basic level' (Geeraerts and others 1994: 134; see further Ungerer and Schmid 2006: ch. 2). This hypothesis, however, is not unproblematic; see Geeraerts and others 1994: ch. 4).

- (5) A core term is less likely than a peripheral term to be culturally restricted; although Carter (Carter 1998: 41) does not refer in his analysis to the fact that core vocabulary does not tend to be dialectally marked, this feature could be associated with the wider lack of culture-specific uses of the core terms. This is, however, a statement that may apply to Present Day English more than Old English because the lack of standardization during the Old English period meant that dialectal differences were more visible in the texts and, indeed, a term that might be dialectally marked might still be a core member of the lexico-semantic field in the dialect(s) where it is used (this may possibly be the case of OE *sander mann*; see below, 3.4.2.13.B).
- (6) Core terms tend to score around the mid-point in evaluative and stylistic scales (i.e. they are not seen as either positive or negative, nor are they considered particularly formal or informal).
- (7) Core terms do not tend to belong to a particular technoelect, although, needless to say, the situation might differ for specific purposes.
- (8) Core terms tend to occur in corpora more frequently than peripheral terms, although measuring frequency is far from straightforward (see further Nation 1990: chs 3 and 5). One of the problems involved in measuring frequency is whether we count just the term itself or whether we also count other members of its word-field; references to frequency in the sections below tend to refer to the count of the term under consideration itself, rather than the whole word-field. As noted above, though, the size of its word-field is a criterion when considering the coreness of a term.

To these criteria we could add the fact that core terms tend to be native words rather than loans (see Stubbs 1986: 103). However, as noted by Thomason (Thomason 2001: 72), in particular contact situations (including the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact; see above, 1.3.2 and 3.2.1) core vocabulary can also be borrowed.

In 3.4.2 the lexico-semantic fields are discussed in the same order as they appear in Table 3. Each field is further divided into subfields or submeanings; the subfields are represented in capitals rather than within inverted commas so as to distinguish them from the meaning or translation of individual Old English terms. The Norse-derived terms are discussed in connection with those lexico-semantic fields rather than in connection with their word-fields. This arrangement is particularly useful in the analysis of legal terms because in some cases Norse-derived terms belonging to different word-fields are part of a single lexico-semantic field.



Given its focus on lexico-semantic fields, this section will not refer to the Norse-derived function words (OE *bāðe*, *fra* / *fro*, *fraward*, *hānum*, and *ōc*). It is also important to bear in mind that the reason for the use in a particular text of a term presenting a Norse-derived formal variant of a native word (i.e. the OE *ār* word-field, *band*, *brynige*, the *cōp* word-field, *loft*, *hæil*, *rennan*, the *saht* (?) word-field, *ðorp*, *wælrēaf*, and *wæð*) is likely to have been associated with dialectal rather than semantic or stylistic matters.<sup>8</sup> That is also the case as far as the terms belonging to the lexico-semantic fields of measurements and amounts are concerned, because they differ from their native counterparts in terms of their dialectal distribution<sup>9</sup> and, closely associated with this, the cultural practices they represent. All the terms belonging to this lexico-semantic field are attested during the Old English period in texts dating from the middle of the ninth century onwards associated with the Scandinavian newcomers and their areas of settlement.<sup>10</sup> Thus, not much attention is paid to these by-forms and dialectally restricted terms in the subsections below.

<sup>8</sup> See R. Jones and others 2009 and Cullen and others 2011 on the semantic relationship between OE *ðorp* and *drop*. Cullen and others argue that the two terms should be seen as dialectal variants referring to small, subsidiary settlements which were established in conjunction with the development of open-field agriculture around the middle of the ninth century (in the interpolation recorded in ChronE (Irvine) 963, the Norse-derived term renders L *appendiciis*, cp. L *appendix* 'appendage; addition, supplement', in S 787; see Irvine 2004: xciv–xcvi, and Kelly 2009: no. 16). That speakers of Old English are likely to have been aware of the foreign / dialectally marked character of some of the terms may be suggested by the attempts to Anglicize the members of the *\*cōp* word-field (see above, 2.2.1.2.B)

<sup>9</sup> During the Middle English period we see an extension in the use of some of these terms (e.g. ME *ploughlōnd* is recorded in the early fourteenth-century *Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester* in a context without a particular reference to the areas settled by the Scandinavians; see Wright 1887: l. 7676; see the MED: s.vv. *hundred*, card. num., sense 2, *plough-lōnd*, *skeppe*, and *scōre*, n., sense 3), although the reflexes of OE *ðreve* and *ðrinna* continue to be mainly associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see the MED: s.vv. *thrēve* and *thrin*, and the OED 1989: s.vv. *thrave*, *threave* and *thrin*, *thrinne*; see also the EDD: s.vv. *hundred*, sense 5, *plough*, sense II.28, *score*, v.<sup>1</sup> and sb.<sup>1</sup>, *skep*, and *thrave*, sb. and v.<sup>1</sup>).

<sup>10</sup> We need to remember that, even though the drafting of Ch 659 (Birch 1029) cannot be clearly associated with the areas settled by the Scandinavian newcomers, OE *manslot* is used in connection with lands in Nottinghamshire, one of the Five Boroughs (see above, 1.3.1, and below, II.26).

### 3.4.2. The Lexico-Semantic Fields Including Norse-Derived Terms

#### 3.4.2.1. Crafts and trade

Trading and raiding went hand in hand in Viking expeditions and activities abroad, and it is no coincidence that the Scandinavians were closely associated with the development of both York and Dublin as significant trading centres during the Viking Age (see, for instance, Wallace 1987 and R. Hall 2001). It is therefore not surprising to find Norse-derived terms associated with this lexico-semantic field, which can be said to comprise or be very closely associated with crafts production already during the Old English period. As the lines below indicate, the terms belonging to this field recorded during the Old English period represent different stages in the spectrum of integration and distribution of the loans.

#### (A) UTENSILS: CUTTING TOOLS (OE *cnīf*)

OE *cnīf* shows the most advanced state of integration into the lexico-semantic field, being recorded already in the Ælfrician corpus (Group 3): i.e. it is a term with a relatively early attestation, probably the earliest of the group, and it is used already in its first attestation without any particular connection with the Scandinavian newcomers (see above, 3.3.3 and 3.3.5). We should not forget, though, that this is precisely the term in the group whose Norse derivation is most problematic and, therefore, this distribution could be seen not as surprising or indicative of significant Anglo-Scandinavian and interdialectal linguistic contact, but rather as evidence of its non-Scandinavian origin (see above, 2.5.B).

Despite its relatively early attestation and its apparent lack of association with the Scandinavianized areas, the noun seems to have been a peripheral member of its lexico-semantic field during the Old English period. OE *cnīf* renders L *artavus* 'knife, penknife' in ÆGl 315.16, which suggests that the term referred to a small knife; this seems to be the sense as well in Charm 12.2 (Storms), where the addressee is requested to do some carving with 'þines cnifes orde' ('the point of your penknife'). This makes it a (near)synonym of OE *seax*; the equivalence of the two terms can be seen in the use of the Middle English compound *nail knif* 'nail knife' in ClIGl 25 to render L *novacula* 'razor, knife; knife for clipping nails' instead of ME *nail sax*, the reflex of the Old English compound which was commonly chosen to render the term in Old English glossaries (see below, IV.2.4.F). Interestingly, though, while *knif* and *sax* were used as (near)synonyms during the Middle English period (see the MED: s.vv. *knif* and *sax*), eventually the borrowed term remained as the non-marked item,

while the native noun underwent a process of semantic specialization: it is recorded in post-medieval texts mainly as ‘a chopping-tool used for trimming slates’ (see the *OED* 1989: s.v. *sax*, n.1).

(B) GOODS: MADE (PARTIALLY) WITH GOLD (OE *goldwrecen*), and MADE WITH SKIN, HIDE, OR FELL (OE *scinn* word-field)

OE *goldwrecen* is a very peripheral member of its lexico-semantic field. It is a hapax legomenon, whose use is associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see above, 3.3.4).<sup>11</sup> It is one of the three compounds which the *TOE* presents as meaning ‘inlaid, adorned with gold’ in Old English (*TOE*: 17.02.05.02), the other two being OE *goldfæted* and *goldfæg*. The latter was clearly the more common term in Old English, OE *goldfæted* being attested only once, and, indeed, OE *goldfæg* is the only compound whose reflex is attested in Middle English texts (see the *MED*: s.v. *göld*, n.). Amongst other contexts, OE *goldfæg* is attested in Ch 1539 (Whitelock 3), which, like Ch 1537 (Whitelock 27), the text recording OE *goldwrecen* (see below, II.158), is a will. It is therefore most likely that the main difference in usage between these two terms lies in their dialectal distribution, rather than in their meaning or register.

The terms belonging to the OE *scinn* word-field represent a middle point in the imaginary scale of integration into their lexico-semantic field. Even though they are not recorded until the eleventh century, their earliest records seem to hint already at a somewhat widespread use: not only has the simplex become productive (see above, 2.2.2.2.C), but we also find that the word-field is not restricted to the Scandinavianized areas (see above, 3.3.6). This widespread use of the word-field is seen in particular from late Middle English onwards, for the very few attestations of the field in pre-1350 texts are still generally used in connection with the Scandinavianized areas (see the *MED*: s.vv. *skin*, n.1, *skinnen* and *skinnere*).

The *TOE* (02.06.01.06) lists five other Old English terms with the meaning ‘skin, hide’: OE *fell*, *flies*, *hȳd*, *hyrd*, and *sweard*. Of these, though, only OE *fell* and *hȳd* can be considered to be equivalent to OE *scinn*, given that the others have rather specialized meanings: OE *flies* meant ‘the wool of sheep’ (see the

<sup>11</sup> Despite seemingly being the term with the narrowest distribution and shortest lifespan of the Norse-derived terms associated with crafts and trade, OE *goldwrecen* is attested relatively early. However, it cannot be easily interpreted as an early window into the types of activities the Scandinavians engaged in once they had settled in England, because the adjective could have been borrowed in association with items inlaid with gold or made with gold which were brought over rather than produced on Anglo-Scandinavian soil.

DOE: s.v. *flȳs*, *flēos*); OE *hyrd* seems to have meant either ‘parchment’ or ‘skin of a deer or fawn’, in which case it would be a variant of OE *heorða* (see Toller 1921: s.v. *hyrd*, and A. Campbell 1972: s.v. *hirde*); and OE *sweard* seems to refer to ‘the continuous flexible integument forming the usual external covering of an animal body’ (OED 1989: s.v. *skin*, n., sense II.8.a), rather than to an animal’s hide as a coveted possession (it is mainly recorded as a gloss for L *cutis* ‘skin (human or unspecified)’).

The preference for OE *scinn* over OE *fell* and *hȳd* in our texts may be associated, not only with the dialect of the text (in particular, with regard to the late Old English northern annals here referred to as ChronNor2; see above, 3.3.6, and below, II.163.17), but also with the nature of the furs referred to. In the 1075-annal of the D version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* we read: ‘geafon him myccla geofa & manega garsama & callon his mannan, on scynnan mid pælle betogen, & on merðerne pyleceon, & graschynnene, & hearmascynnene, & on pællon’ (ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.11–12; ‘gave him and all his men great gifts and many treasures in furs covered with purple cloth, and in pelisses of marten-fur, and squirrel-fur and ermine-fur’). OE *hearma* is otherwise recorded in various glossaries as a gloss for Gr. *μυγαλῆ* ‘shrew-mouse, field-mouse’ and L *nitela* ‘shrew-mouse, dormouse’, and this usage can hardly be associated with the annal’s reference to ermine as a highly coveted animal for its skin.<sup>12</sup> The list of gifts by Bishop Leofric of Exeter (Rec 10.1 (RobApp I 1)) mentions three bearskins amongst other expensive vestments, and bearskins are otherwise only mentioned in Old English texts in Ohthere’s description of the tribute that he receives from the Sami in the so-called Old English Orosius (Or 1 1.15.18–19): he explains that, amongst other items, he receives from those in the highest rank one bearskin (‘an beran fel’), a coat of bear- or otter skin (‘berenne kyrtel oððe yterenne’), and fifteen marten skins.<sup>13</sup> We know that bearskins, like squirrel, ermine, and marten skins, were some of the products traded by Viking Age Scandinavians (see G. Jones 1984: 163–64, and P. Sawyer 1984). Therefore, it is likely that the Norse-derived terms have been chosen

<sup>12</sup> The relative rarity of ermine skin in England may be further suggested by the fact that the *MED* does not record ME *ermīn* with the meanings ‘white fur of this animal [...], esp. as used for costly garments or trimmings’ and ‘pelt of such fur’ until the fourteenth century (*MED*: s.v. *ermīn*, sense 2). For an analysis of the vestments and furs mentioned in this passage, see further Owen-Crocker 1998: 36–37.

<sup>13</sup> On the tribute payments by the Sami to Ohthere, see further Valtonen 2008: 315–20. On the relationship between the Scandinavians and the Sami with regard to fur trade, see also Bergman and others 2007, with references.

in the aforementioned contexts because the products they are associated with were foreign to the Anglo-Saxons. It is also interesting to note that the two contexts recording this word-field emphasize the high value of these items (the Norse-derived OE *gærsu(m)a* is recorded in both contexts; see above, 3.3.6, and below, 3.4.2.12.B.1 and I.35.3); thus, the Norse-derived terms may have been intended to increase the ‘foreignness’ and hence value of the items. It is, however, difficult to prove this suggestion because we cannot know for certain whether the terms would have still been perceived as loans.

### 3.4.2.2. Legal world

The earliest attestations of Norse-derived terms belonging to this semantic field (i.e. the terms recorded in texts belonging to Groups 2 and 3; see above, 3.3.2–3) already represent the three legal areas comprising all the Norse-derived legal terms recorded in Old English:

- (1) agreements and negotiations, within which peace (and possibly commercial) agreements are particularly significant (OE *brýðhlōp*, the \**cōp* word-field, *cost*, *fēolaga*, *feste*, *fēstermann*, *formāl*, *frīðmāl*, *grið*, and *sammæle*);<sup>14</sup>
- (2) the judicial process (OE *hāmsōcn*, the *craſian* and *cwyddian* word-fields, the *lagu* word-field, the *sac* word-field, *saclēas*, and *walrēaf*);<sup>15</sup>
- (3) the administrative organization of the legal system (OE *wāpentac*).

The borrowing of many of the terms in the first group could be associated with the period previous to the settlement of the Scandinavian newcomers, when agreements aiming at putting an end to the attacks of the Scandinavian marauders would have been common. However, some of the terms might also give us an indication of the types of activities the Scandinavian newcomers would have been involved in once they settled in England, e.g. purchase of land. The attestation of OE *brýðhlōp* already in a text belonging to Group 2 (see above, 3.3.2) could suggest that marriage agreements (cp. OE *mund and māldeg*) and feasts may also have been part of their everyday life in England from early on. The terms associated with the various stages of the judicial process and the admin-

<sup>14</sup> On the possible reference of OE *labcōp* to any purchase conducted according to the legal procedures as opposed to the typically Scandinavian tradition of buying one’s right to legal protection back, see above, 2.2.1.2.B. Cp. the OE *sabt* word-field and the expressions OE *cuman tō wīðermāle* and *mund and māldeg*, on which see below in this section.

<sup>15</sup> Cp. OE *cyrīcrēn*, *drīncelēan*, the *frīð* word-field, *nām*, *orrest*, *scēr* and the expression *beran ūp māl*.

istrative organization of the legal system point in the main to a period of borrowing after the settlement of the Scandinavian newcomers. Their initial use is likely to be the result of the presence of a new Scandinavian ruling class, who made administrative and legal decisions in the Danelaw affecting both the newcomers and the native inhabitants, and who had political and economic dealings with neighbours outside the Danelaw.

It is amongst the terms representing this lexico-semantic field that we find the word-fields with most members, be it the result of borrowing of ready-made complexes or English new formations following the integration of the Norse-derived terms in the language. This is likely to be associated with the fact that, as pointed out by Maley,

the first and most obvious way to regulate a domain of social experience or activity is to develop a specialized and technical vocabulary which will conceptualize the semantic field as a set of related terms, and fixed or semi-fixed collocations. (Maley 1944: 22)

Compounds and derivatives develop on the basis of simplexes so as to allow for the expression of various concepts and ideas around the simplex. When a Norse-derived simplex replaces a native term, lexical gaps arise and they need to be filled through word-formation processes: e.g. while OE *cýricfrið* 'right of sanctuary' and *ǣlic* 'legal, lawful' are well-established in Old English, the use of OE *grīð* and *lagu* to express some of the ideas previously expressed by their native synonyms creates the necessity to develop the equivalent compounds OE *cýricgrīð* and *lahlic*.

As is the case with the earliest attestations of Norse-derived terms representing other lexico-semantic fields, most of the Norse-derived legal terms recorded in Groups 2 and 3 are associated with the Scandinavians, either directly or through their dialectal distribution (see above, 3.3.2–3). In some cases, the use of the terms does not seem to have gone past this initial association; in others, this association seems to have been forgotten fairly quickly during the Old English period or at least during the Middle English period. The following subsections analyse the terms in more detail.

#### (A) LAW, BODY OF RULES (OE *lagu* word-field)

OE *lagu* is one of the most interesting Norse-derived terms first attested during the Old English period in terms of its integration into its lexico-semantic field, because Old English texts show us its transition from a culturally marked peripheral term to the core member of the field. The following lines explore this process and the possible reasons behind it in more detail.



The *TOE* (14, 14.01.02, and 16.02.01.09) notes that OE *lagu* could have various meanings and, therefore, it overlaps with various native terms:

- (1) ‘law, statute, article of legislation’, a meaning shared with OE *ǣ*, *ǣbebod*, *ǣbod*, *āsetnes*, *dōm*, *hāt*, *inseten*, *insetnis*, *(ge)rǣdnes*, *(ge)riht* and *(ge)setnes*;
- (2) ‘rule, order, precept, tenet, principle’, a meaning which it shares with OE *bebod*, *bīsen*, *diht*, *regol*, *rihtung*, *sidung*, *sōðword*, *stēor(e)*.

Due to spatial limitations, it is not possible to analyse the semantic and stylistic relationship between the Norse-derived term and all its (near)synonyms. This section will therefore focus mainly on the way in which the term functions in the Wulfstanian texts, which constitute the most significant corpus for the study of this term in Old English.

OE *lagu* first appears in the *OEC* as a culturally marked term: in its first attestation in *IV Edgar* it refers specifically to the secular laws of the Scandinavians as opposed to the laws of the Anglo-Saxon population (see above, 3.3.2).<sup>16</sup> However, during the reign of Æthelred (978–1016) it became fully naturalized as a legal term (cp. ‘Engla lage’ in *I Æthelred*; see above, 3.3.3). In this legal sphere, meaning ‘law, article of legislation’, it competes mainly with OE *(ge)rǣdnes*, OE *ǣ* and *dōm* having become obsolete by that time in that context, and OE *āsetnes* being found only once in a legal code (LawWILad 0.1; see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 85–86 and 88–89). In Wulfstan’s works, the use of OE *(ge)rǣdnes* is particularly formulaic, as it tends to appear in the traditional construction ‘Ðis is seo gerǣdnes þe [legislators, normally the king and his *witan*] + *cweðan* / *rǣðan*’ (e.g. LawVAttr 02, LawVIAttr 0.2, LawICn 0.1, etc.) or in the Wulfstanian constructions ‘ures hlaforðes gerǣdnes 7 his witenas is þæt ...’ and ‘witenas gerǣdnes is þæt ...’ (e.g. LawVAttr 1.1, LawVAttr 2, etc.).

From a legal perspective, though, the main (near)synonym of OE *lagu* in the Wulfstanian corpus is clearly OE *riht*. The relationship between the two word-fields can be summarized as follows:

[OE *lagu* is] more common than *riht* when referring to a specific set of laws, whether they are customary laws (*folc[lagu/riht]*) or secular laws (*woruld[lagu/riht]*). The derivative *unlagu* is commonly used instead of *unriht* when the concept implied is ‘wrong, crime, breach of the law’. The integration of *lagu* [into Wulfstan’s vocabulary] has gone even further: the loan-word has invaded the semantic space of *riht* when referring to the rights associated with a specific position (*ðegn[lagu/*

<sup>16</sup> On the socio-political reasons that Edgar may have had to refer to the laws of the Scandinavians in his fourth code, see Hadley 2002: 48–49, with references.



*riht*]). Thus, the blurred boundaries between *lagu* and *riht* make the interpretation of *labriht* and *rihtlagu* particularly problematic. (Pons-Sanz 2007b: 124)

In the religious sphere, OE *lagu* most clearly overlaps with OE *ǣ* and *bebod* ‘commandment’. While OE *ǣ* continues to be used until c. 1200 (see A. Fischer 1989, and Dance forthcoming a), it is clearly avoided by Wulfstan, who prefers to employ OE *lagu* to refer to both religious and secular laws. Thus, in the Wulfstanian canon, the main religious (near)synonym of OE *lagu* is OE *bebod*: the two terms are used in the same collocations and linked by coordination, and there are some cases when OE *lagu* is even used to refer to a subset of the religious laws, the Ten Commandments; this is a usage traditionally dominated by OE *bebod* (see further Pons-Sanz 2007b: 98–99). Probably the two main reasons for Wulfstan’s avoidance of OE *ǣ* in the sense ‘religious law’ are

- (1) the use of one single term to refer to all laws allowed him to mirror linguistically his belief that secular laws should follow religious laws; and
- (2) OE *ǣ* was a polysemous word (besides ‘law’, it could mean as well ‘marriage’, and some of its forms made it homonymous with OE *ǣwe* ‘wife, married woman’; see the *DOE*: s.v. *ǣ*), so its use could lead to confusion, whereas OE *lagu* had a more restricted range of senses (see further Pons-Sanz 2007b: 221–23).

Wulfstan was, seemingly, the first author to use OE *lagu* to refer to religious laws, and it is clear that his works played a very significant role in the generalization of that usage (see further Pons-Sanz 2007b: 231–34 and 245–52). The influential character of the Wulfstanian compositions, amongst both the Archbishop’s contemporaries and later authors, and the formulaic character of the legal language contributed to the fast increase in the use of OE *lagu* in late Old English legal and non-legal texts, and the decrease in the use of OE *ǣ*.<sup>17</sup> Fischer (A. Fischer 1989: 113–14) explains the quick disappearance of its early Middle English reflex as a result of the fact that it must have sounded very foreign to the Norman conquerors, while the phonological structure of OE *lagu* / ME *laue* clearly associated it with OF *loi* and L *lex* (cp. Dance forthcoming a).

<sup>17</sup> Notably, though, despite the fast integration of the OE *lagu* word-field in Old English, OE *labslite*, which is first recorded in Wulfstan’s works, never ceased to be associated with the Scandinavian practices (see further Pons-Sanz 2007b: 85–86 and 311).

**(B) BREAKING THE LAW: CRIMES AND THEIR PERPETRATORS** (OE *cýricrēn*, *hāmsōcn*, and *nīðing*)

OE *rān* seems to have been a very peripheral member of its lexico-semantic field, on the basis of the limited attestations of the simplex and OE *cýricrēn*, the only other member of the word-field. While OE *rān* is only recorded in a post-Conquest Latin text (see above, 2.2.1.8.D), the compound is a Wulfstanian hapax legomenon (see below, I.20).

As noted above, 2.2.1.8.D, the semantic relationship between OE *rān* on the one hand and OE *ðýfð* and *stalu* on the other is not clear, but the extant evidence suggests that the former refers to a crime committed in daylight and, possibly, violently, while the latter refer to a crime committed in secrecy. If that is the case, OE *cýricrēn* may have referred to the forcible entry and robbery of goods from a church in daylight. The secretive counterpart of the crime may be referred to in one of the headings to King Alfred's laws, which is given as 'Be circan stale' (LawAfRb 6); the decree this heading refers to, LawAf 6–6.1, uses the verb OE *ðeofian*, which is equivalent to L *furari* (i.e. to the verb which belongs to the same word-field as L *furtum*). It seems then that the introduction of the loan-word may have allowed, as in other cases (e.g. *drincelēan*, see below, 3.4.2.2.E.3), for greater semantic specialization;<sup>18</sup> after all, the legal technoelect seeks precision as one of its most significant aims (see, for instance, Tiersma 1999: ch. 5).

The semantic relationship between OE *hāmsōcn* and its native (near)synonyms is also fairly problematic. OE *hāmsōcn* could mean both the actual crime of 'home-seeking' or attacking someone in his own house (e.g. LawIICn 62), and the privilege to judge that crime and to receive the fine to be paid for it (e.g. LawIICn 12 and 15, and Ch 986 (Harm 28) 4; see further below, 3.4.2.2.C.3). It is difficult to know the exact nature of the crime described by this compound. The fines specified in LawIICn 62 associate this decree with LawIICn 58–58.1, where the same amounts are demanded when the king's or the archbishop's *borg* is violated. OE *hāmsōcn* should also be associated with OE *hūsbyrce*, which appears in LawIICn 64. The distinction between these terms is not obvious from their context, though. Brunner (H. Brunner 1906–28: II, 651), followed by Robertson (Robertson 1925: 358 n. to LawIICn 64), claims that the distinction may lie in that OE *hūsbyrce* involved the destruction or damage of the house itself, while Steenstrup (Steenstrup 1882: 350) denies the connection

<sup>18</sup> See Durkin 2009: 141, 145 on the difference between the filling of a lexical gap with a loan-word and the development of a new semantic category thanks to the presence of a loan-word. On lexical gaps, see further Lehrer 1974: ch. 5, and A. Fischer 2000.

between OE *hūsbyrce* and the Latin phrase *destructio domus* ‘destruction of the house’, preferring to attribute the difference between OE *hāmsōcn* and *hūsbyrce* to the fact that the latter would be a more serious crime in which manslaughter or injury would have been involved. Colman (R. Colman 1981 and R. Colman 1985) argues that these two words may simply involve a temporary variation in terminology resulting from the Danish conquest (the term which surfaces in the legal literature of the post-Conquest period is OE *hāmsōcn*).<sup>19</sup> Thus, as is the case with other Norse-derived terms (e.g. OE *lagu*; see above, 3.4.2.2.A), a term which is likely to have started life as a peripheral member of the field made its way towards the centre of the field already during the Old English period (notably, though, the extant records do not allow us to see any initial association of the term with the Scandinavian newcomers; see above, 3.3.2).

Besides terms for crimes, the Old English legal technoelect also seems to have included a term for a person who engages in unlawful activities, i.e. a law-breaker, viz. OE *nīðing*. In the Scandinavian laws, the etymon of OE *nīðing* is clearly associated with the lexico-semantic field of outlawry. Larson defines the *nīðing crime* as follows: ‘a crime, usually murder, committed under such circumstances and by such methods as to give the criminal the character of a nīðing (a mean, infamous, treacherous person). Nīðing deeds usually led to permanent outlawry’ (Larson 1935: 423). This definition suggests that, while the term *nīðingr* conveys a moral judgement, which is likely to be its original usage, there is also a legal aspect generally associated with it (cp. Ström 1942: 58–69, and Jesch 2001b: 258–60). The legal implications of OE *nīðing* are not clear. As noted by Liebermann (Liebermann 1910: 20) and in the words of Rumball, ‘although Scandinavian *nīðings* are outlawed, English *nīðings* appear utterly disgraced, but not quite outlawed’ (Rumball 2008: 55). This conclusion is supported by the three contexts where the members of the word-field appear in Old English texts (see below, I.63.1): in LawWal1 it is associated with plundering the dead, which, as noted by Rumball, ‘had been thought of as one the worst crimes, and *nīðing* therefore especially opprobrious, but is always emendable in Old English and continental Germanic laws’ (Rumball 2008: 54).<sup>20</sup> In ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1049 we are told that the king and the *here* proclaimed

<sup>19</sup> The *TOE* does not hint at a direct relationship between these terms, though: while OE *hāmsōcn* is included under 14.02.01.01 (‘types of crime’) and is translated as ‘forcible entry into a man’s house’, OE *hūsbyrce* is included under 14.02.01.02 (‘wrongful taking, theft’) and is translated as ‘housebreaking, burglary’.

<sup>20</sup> See, however, *Leges Henrici* §83.4–5, where outlawry is presented as a punishment for despoiling the dead (see Liebermann 1903–16: I.547–611).

Swegen a *nīðing*.<sup>21</sup> Rumball rightly points out that ‘it is doubtful whether the *here* could normally function like a court in pronouncing outlawry’,<sup>22</sup> and that, while ChronE (Irvine) 1048 and ChronF (Baker) 1050 say that Swegen was outlawed, ‘it does not follow that *nīðing* encompasses his outlawry’ (Rumball 2008: 55). Similarly, the use of the complex *unnīðing* in connection with obedience to the king’s summons in ChronE (Irvine) 1087 (see below, I.63.2) is analysed by Rumball as follows: ‘disobeying the king’s summons to the host usually entails a hefty fine in English and Frankish law, not outlawry, and *nīðing* could be the Chronicler’s [*sic*] moral judgement on slackers rather than the king’s judicial one’ (Rumball 2008: 54–55). This connection of the term with the moral sphere is further suggested by the Middle English reflexes of OE *nīðing* and *unnīðing*; while ME *nīthing* meant ‘a wretch, coward, good-for-nothing’ and ‘a stingy or miserly person, niggard’, ME *unnīthing* is only attested with the possible meaning ‘generous, open-handed’ (see the *MED*: s.vv. *nīthing* and *unnīthing* and below, IV.2.4.G).

From this perspective, then, OE *nīðing* does not overlap with OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah*, *flyma*, and *frīðlēas* (on which see below, 3.4.2.2.C.3), but rather, as noted by the *TOE* (14.02), with terms meaning ‘law-breaker’, such as OE *æslitend*, *ræpling*, *rihthanddæda*, *ðēodsceaða*, and *wearg*. Of these terms, those closest to OE *nīðing* may be OE *ræpling* and *ðēodsceaða* given that OE *æslitend* and *rihthanddæda* are very uncommon, and that OE *wearg*, though common, is not recorded either in the laws or in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (cf. OE *wirgan* in LawAfEl 15). OE *nīðing*, *ræpling*, and *ðēodsceaða* differ in various respects, though. On the one hand, as we may expect, the native terms have a wider range of meanings than the loan-word: OE *ræpling* could also mean ‘captive, prisoner’. On the other hand, and closely connected with this, the native terms are used in a wider variety of genres, although neither term covers the two genres where OE *nīðing* is used: OE *ræpling* is not used in the laws, while OE

<sup>21</sup> Barlow suggests that the use of OE *nīðing* in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1049 in connection with Swegen is particularly appropriate because he was ‘not only reckless but completely Scandinavian in his interests’ (Barlow 1970: 70–71). It is, however, difficult to argue that the chronicler may have had such connection in mind when using the loan-word. We could consider that the association with Scandinavian practices and attitudes is further suggested by the fact that it was the king and the *here* that declared Swegen a *nīðing*. However, as noted by Hooper (Hooper 1992a: 5), by the eleventh century, the distinction between *fyrð* (originally, the Anglo-Saxon army) and *here* (originally, an army composed by Scandinavians) was no longer maintained and the two terms were used more or less interchangeably.

<sup>22</sup> See also Hooper 1992a: 4–6 on this context.

*ðēodsceaða* does not appear in the *Chronicle*. This suggests that OE *nīðing* was borrowed as a rather specialized term, with a narrow meaning and with a strong connection with the legal technolact, its uses being restricted to legal texts or legal contexts within historical texts.<sup>23</sup> It is only when we move to the Middle English period that we see the term coming free from these restrictions (see the *MED*: s.v. *nīthing*).

### (C) THE LEGAL PROCESS

(C.1) BRINGING A LEGAL ACTION AGAINST SOMEONE (OE *māl*, *wiðermāl*, *craflan*, *cwyddian*, *orrest*, *uncwydd*, *un(be)crafod*, *sac* word-field, *saclēas*, and *scēr*)

This section covers the Norse-derived terms referring to 'legal action' itself, some of the processes involved in bringing a legal action against someone and pursuing it, and their outcome (i.e. whether someone is considered to be innocent or guilty).

OE *māl* has three main meanings: '(legal) action, suit, cause, claim', the meaning discussed in this section, 'agreement, treaty, stipulation', and 'contract of service; covenanted wages', which are discussed below (3.4.2.2.E.2). All the members of the *māl* word-field seem to have been peripheral members of their respective lexico-semantic fields, and while their use is in some cases clearly associated with Norse-influenced lexical practices, this is not the case for all the occurrences of the word-field.

The *TOE* (14.03.03) gives OE *sacu*, *sp(r)æc*, and *talū* as equivalent to OE *māl* when it means '[legal] action, suit, cause, claim'. OE *māl* with the meaning under discussion is only attested in ChronE (Irvine) 1052 = ChronF (Baker) 1051, where it appears as part of the Norse-derived phrase OE *beran ūp māl* (see above, 3.3.6, and below, I.58.3). Its limited attestation suggests that OE *māl* was only a very marginal member of the lexico-semantic field, and, indeed, it is not clear whether its Middle English reflex is actually recorded with this meaning (see the *MED*: s.v. *mōl*, n.2, sense c). Unfortunately, the block of annals with which this annal can be associated do not use any of the Old English terms which have the same meaning as OE *māl*, and, therefore, it is not possible to establish any comparisons in use. In any case, the choice of this legal formula in an annal which may originate from the south-east (see below, II.163.20) remains an interesting and slightly puzzling usage, although the presence of the formula could be associated with the use of another member of

<sup>23</sup> Like other Norse-derived terms, OE *nīðing* might have also been dialectally and/or ethnically restricted, but the extant textual records do not allow us to see this (see above, 3.3.3 and 3.3.6).

the OE *māl* word-field, viz. OE *sammæle*, in Ch 1455 (Rob 62), a document from St Augustine's, Canterbury (see below, II.135).

The meaning of OE *māl* under consideration can be said to be present as well in OE *wiðermāl* 'counterplea, defence', which is only attested in the formula OE *cuman tō wiðermāle*, used twice in ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1. The *TOE* (14.03.03.01.01) lists OE *wiðertalu*, *lād*, and *wiðertihle* as synonyms of OE *wiðermāl*. Of them, OE *lād* is certainly the most common term and the term preferred in the legal texts (see e.g. LawVIIIATR 27.1 and LawCn 1020 12); OE *wiðertihle* is only recorded twice in legal texts (LawIEW 1.5 and LawIICn 27), while OE *wiðertalu* is only recorded once in the *OEC*, in a homiletic text.<sup>24</sup> Unfortunately, none of these terms is recorded in the block of annals with which ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1 should be associated; therefore, it is not easy to establish any semantic or stylistic nuances that may have differentiated the term from its native counterparts in the idiolect of the chronicler(s) responsible for these annals. Yet it seems that OE *wiðermāl*, like the Norse-derived simplex it is related to, was a peripheral member of the word-field. The use of the formula OE *cuman tō wiðermāle* in the D-annal, like the use of OE *beran ūp māl* in ChronE (Irvine) 1052 = ChronF (Baker) 1051, remains difficult to account for; its selection may be the result of the links which Worcester had with Old Norse and Norse-influenced varieties of Old English at the likely time of the composition of the 1052.1-annal (see below, 4.2.1 and II.163.16), although this suggestion has to remain purely speculative.

The *TOE* (14.03.03.01) gives two Old English verbs with the meaning 'to summon': *crafian* and *stefnian*. On the basis of their limited number of attestations (see below, I.16, for the OE *crafian* word-field, and III.4.PPP for OE *stefnian*), neither term seems to have been particularly common, although OE *crafian* appears to have enjoyed a more central position in the legal language.<sup>25</sup> This is suggested not only by the fact that all the members of the OE *crafian* word-field are recorded in legal texts, while OE *stefnian* is not, but also by the fact that the verb has participated in processes of word-formation (consider the past participle OE *un(be)crafod*, on which see below). Middle English texts

<sup>24</sup> None of these terms, though, seems to have made it into the Middle English legal language: while the *MED* does not record any Middle English reflexes of OE *wiðertalu*, *wiðertihle*, or *wiðermāl*, ME *lōde* with the meaning 'an oath of purgation' is only recorded in the Laws of Henry I (see the *MED*: s.v. *lōd(e)*, sense 3).

<sup>25</sup> Old English legal texts do not make many references to someone being summoned before a tribunal; it is more common to find references to claims being brought up against someone or something.



also give an indication of the slightly more central position of OE *crafian*: while they do not record a Middle English reflex of OE *stefnian*, they do have examples of ME *crāven* with the legal senses ‘to interrogate someone judicially’ and ‘to accuse someone’ (see the *MED*: s.v. *crāven*, senses 3.b and 4).

OE *crafian* commonly collocates with OE *cwyddian* with the Norse-derived meaning ‘to accuse, make a claim against (someone)’. The *TOE* suggests that, when OE *cwyddian* has that meaning, it can be associated with OE *sacan* and *sp(r)ecan æfter / on / ymb* (*TOE*: 14.03.03.01). OE *sacan* as a simplex does not seem to have been commonly used in Old English legal texts, although various complexes belonging to this word-field were clearly part of the Old English legal technoelect: for instance, OE *atsacan* ‘to deny, abjure’ (e.g. LawIIAs 4 and 6, LawNorthu 52, etc.), *onsacan* ‘to deny’ (e.g. LawIne 28.2, 45, 46, etc.), *oðsacan* ‘to deny’ (e.g. LawIne 41, LawIIAtr 4, etc.), and *unbesacen* (see below). It is rather OE *sp(r)ecan æfter* and *sp(r)ecan on* that seem to have been the core expressions. We find OE *sp(r)ecan on*, for instance, in LawIIIAtr 14 (in clear contrast to OE *uncwydd* and *uncrafod*, on which see below) and OE *sp(r)ecan æfter* in a late charter from Herefordshire (Ch 1462 (Rob 78)), while the simplex OE *cwyddian* with the Norse-derived meaning is only recorded once in the *OEC* (see below, I.19.1); similarly, the *MED* (s.vv. *quidden* and *spēken*) records this meaning for the Middle English reflex of OE *sp(r)ecan*, not *cwyddian*.

The two negated past participles OE *uncwydd* and *un(be)crafod* are the most common members of their respective word-fields. They are always recorded together, and this may have facilitated the only attestation of the simplex OE *cwyddian* with the Norse-derived meaning, for in that context (LawBecwæð 3.1) the two verbs are also coordinated. Clearly, their alliterative character played a very important role in their coordination (cp. Bethurum 1932). These participles, though, were not the most common terms to express the meaning ‘unmolested by litigation; uncontested’. The native OE *unbesacen*, on which the past participles under discussion may have been modelled, is rather the core term in the lexico-semantic field.<sup>26</sup> It is recorded from the late tenth century (e.g. Ch 1454 (Rob 66), Ch 1456 (Rob 69)) to the mid-eleventh century (e.g. Ch 1474 (Rob 105)) in texts from both Scandinavianized (e.g. Rec 24.1 (Rob 84)) and non-Scandinavianized areas. In one context, LawBecwæð 3.1, the uncommon OE *unsac* is used as an equivalent of OE *uncwydd* and *uncrafod*; given that OE *cwyddian* and *crafian* appear in the same context, the choice of this complex instead of the two negated past participles may respond to an attempt to avoid repetition (on OE *unsac*, see further below).

<sup>26</sup> None of the terms seems to have survived into the Middle English period, though.



On the basis of their attestations, it may be the case that the members of the OE *cwyddian* and *crafian* word-fields with the Norse-related meanings were seen as dialectally marked terms during most of the late Old English period, although this is not fully clear. Most of their attestations occur in texts which are clearly associated with the areas where the Scandinavians settled down or in texts the origin of which remains problematic (see above, 3.3.3 and 3.3.6). However, the fact that they are included in *II Cnut*, a text which received royal approval and which is likely to have been circulated all around England, may suggest a wider use. The Cnutian context where they appear relies on a decree from *III Æthelred*, which is connected with the Scandinavianized areas (see below, I.16.2.1 and I.19.2.1); however, on the basis of its occurrence in the Cnutian code, we may have expected some understanding of the decree (and hence the terms) in non-Scandinavianized areas. The use of the word-field in the Cnutian text may have contributed to making the terms familiar in non-Scandinavianized areas, and this may explain the appearance of OE *crafian* with the Norse-derived meaning in an Exeter manumission (Rec 10.6.2 (Dickins-Earle); see above, 3.3.6). Middle English texts might offer further evidence in favour of the association of OE *crafian* with the Scandinavianized areas: the verb with the legal meaning 'to interrogate someone judicially' is only recorded in *Vices and Virtues*, a text whose language Michael Samuels (quoted in Laing 1993: 106) considers to be characteristic of Essex, an area whose linguistic practices could have been influenced by those of the more heavily Scandinavianized neighbouring areas (cp. below, 4.2.4), while the verb meaning 'to accuse someone' is only attested in the Northern Verse Psalter, composed in Yorkshire (see Horstmann 1895–96: II, 129–30). In any case, the limited number of attestations of the word-fields make it very difficult to reach any definitive conclusions.

When someone was accused of a crime, one of the ways to establish his/her innocence or guilt was by engaging in the so-called 'trial by combat'. The *TOE* (14.03.03.05) only records two Old English terms with the meaning 'trial by combat/battle', viz. OE *ornest* and *orrest*. As explained above (2.5.Q), the two terms are closely connected, as it could be the case that the former developed following the association of the Norse-derived *orrest* with the native OE *eornest*. The fact that this lexico-semantic field is so limited is not surprising, given that, as suggested by Bloomfield (Bloomfield 1969: 549), this is a new practice which is likely to have been introduced by the Normans (notice that OE *orrest* is first attested in post-Conquest documents; see below, I.67).

Notably, there seems to exist some variation in the meaning of OE *orrest*. While it and the related OE *ornest* have the seemingly Norman-derived mean-

ing (i.e. ‘trial by battle’) in the texts which do not clearly originate from the Scandinavianized areas, OE *orrest* seems to mean rather ‘battle, combat’ in general in Ch IWM (Davis 6), a text from Bury St Edmunds (see above, 3.3.6), and this usage is comparable to that in *Ormulum* (‘Inn all þatt time he wass. Inn orrest 3æn þe deofell’; see the *OED* 2000–: s.v. *orrest*). It may be the case that the charter records the original meaning with which the term was adopted and that the *Chronicle* entry records a newly developed meaning for the term. The term may not have been fully integrated into Old English, and it may still have been perceived in some circles as foreign; these characteristics would have made it particularly suitable to refer to a new practice imported by foreigners (cp. AN *bataille*, which could mean both ‘battle’ and ‘judicial combat, ordeal by battle’; see the *AND*: s.v. *bataille*<sup>27</sup>).

Besides terms to refer to the process of summoning someone, accusing him/her of a crime, and subjecting him/her to some sort of process to clear his/her name, the Old English legal technolox also includes Norse-derived terms which refer to the outcome of the legal process, i.e. the declaration of someone as guilty or innocent. Although the *TOE* (12.08.09) does not record OE *sac* meaning ‘guilty’, it does mention other Old English terms with that meaning: OE *fāh*, *gyltend*, *gyltig*, *sceaððig*, and *synnig*. None of them, though, could be considered to be fully equivalent to the hapax legomenon OE *sac*, because they do not appear in legal texts (near)contemporary to *III Æthelred*. In any case, the restricted use of the loan-word in Old English and the fact that no Middle English reflex is attested suggests that its selection in the text is likely to be associated with dialectal lexical practices and the use of the echoic OE *saclēas* in the same context (see below in this section and II.13.1.5), rather than with semantic or stylistic differences between the loan-word and the other members of the lexico-semantic field.

The *TOE* gives OE *saclēas* and *unsac* as the Old English terms meaning ‘innocent, free from accusation’ (*TOE*: 14.03.03.08); they overlap with OE *unforworht*, which, albeit not directly associated with them, is given the meaning ‘innocent, not criminal’ in the same *TOE* context. Indeed, that OE *saclēas* and *unsac* are synonyms is suggested by LawIIIAtr 3.1, where OE *saclēas* rather than OE *unsac* is presented as the antonym of OE *sac*. Of the two, OE *saclēas*

<sup>27</sup> The charter is, however, only recorded in two manuscripts from the late thirteenth or early fourteenth century (viz. Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.ii.33, and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847; see Bates 1998: no. 37). Therefore, we cannot exclude the possibility that the more general meaning is actually a later semantic development.

is clearly the more common term.<sup>28</sup> Thus, we find it already in the second half of the tenth century in Aldred's glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels (see above, 3.3.2). It is this term, rather than OE *unsac*, that is also prone to being used in collocations: e.g. OE *scēr and saclēas* in Ch Lambourn (RobAppI 5) (as well as in Ch 1110 (Harm 62); cp. the more clearly alliterating phrase ME *siker and sāklesse* in BenRW; see below, IV.2.3.2.F); and OE *frēo and saclēas* in Rec 10.6.2 (Dickins-Earle) (see further Harmer 1989: 479). Indeed, despite its initial association with the Scandinavianized areas, its use eventually overcame this dialectal restriction; it is first clearly recorded in a text without any connection with the Scandinavianized areas in the charters of Henry I, although its dialectal extension is likely to have happened earlier, as suggested by its use in spurious documents (see below, I.72). The preference for OE *saclēas* over *unsac* may be the result of the fact that it is formed on the basis of a native term (viz. OE *sacu*; see above, 2.4.2.P), which gave it a sense of immediate familiarity and made it appealing because of the trend in legal language to use related terms to lexicalize a particular lexico-semantic field. In fact, this word-field already had another (albeit somewhat semantically different) term, viz. OE *sacful* 'quarrelsome' (see above, 2.4.2.Q). The Old English *sac* word-field, on the contrary, seems to have been fairly uncommon, although the existence of the OE *sacu* word-field may have contributed to its acceptance into Old English. Thus, OE *unsac* is only recorded twice in the corpus (see below, I.71.2) and does not seem to have survived very long after the Old English period (it is not recorded in the *MED*). It means 'innocent' only in LawVatr (D) 32.4, a context which may be attributable to Wulfstan (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 168 n. 23; see above). Its selection, instead of OE *unforworht*, a term which only Wulfstanian contexts record with the meaning 'innocent' (see WHom 20.1.41 = WHom 20.2.47 = WHom 20.3.45, cp. LawVatr 2 = LawVIatr 9), and the more common OE *saclēas* might have been determined by stylistic reasons. The text reads 'be norðam stod seo unlagu, þæt man moste banweorc on unsacne secgan' ('in the north there existed the illegality that homicide could be brought up as a charge on an innocent person'); OE *unsac* not only exhibits structural similarity with OE *unlagu*, but also, as OE *saclēas* would have done, echoes the verb OE *secgan* (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 168).

The association of OE *scēr* with the echoing OE *saclēas* may have contributed to the popularization of the former. We only encounter it during the

<sup>28</sup> The reflexes of OE *sac* and *unsac* are replaced in Middle English by new-formations based on ME *sāke* (< OE *sacu*), viz. ME *sāked* 'guilty' and *unsāked* 'innocent' (see the *MED*: s.vv. *sāked* and *unsāked*).

Old English period in one context, where the alliterative character of the Old English legal language is clearly exemplified ('sker & sakleas, sake & sokne, tol & team' in Ch Lambourn (RobAppI 5) 2–3; 'free and quit, jurisdiction, toll and vouching to warranty', as translated by Robertson 1925: 241).<sup>29</sup> Yet, unlike OE *unsac*, it was frequently used during the Middle English period (see the *MED*: s.v. *skēre*).

(C.2) OFFERING SECURITY AS PART OF THE LEGAL PROCESS: PLEDGE, BONDS-MAN, AND PROPERTY OFFERED AS SECURITY (OE *feste*, *fēstermann*, and *nām*)

The *TOE* (14.03.03.07) records OE *borg* as the main term meaning 'security, pledge, bail' in Old English; unfortunately, it does not record OE *feste*, which has the same meaning. The reason for this may be that the use of the Norse-derived term is restricted to a list of sureties for Peterborough estates, where it is recorded twice, both times in the collocation OE *niman feste* 'to take the pledge' (see below, I.30.1). It seems, therefore, that the loan-word should be understood as a less common, dialectally restricted, equivalent of the native noun.

This description also applies to the compound OE *fēstermann* 'bondsman, security', all the attestations of which are restricted to texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see above, 3.3.2–3, and below, I.30.2). Interestingly, the list of Peterborough sureties combines the use of the Norse-derived compound with OE *borg* (Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) 21) and *borbhand* (Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) 18, 24, 31, 32, 34, and 113) to express the meaning 'bondsman, security', clearly treating them as (near)synonymous. On the basis of the dialectal restriction of the compound, it is notable that it appears in a rubric to ch. 38 ('de emptioni-bus sine fideiussoribus, quod Anglice dicitur fastermannes') in the version of the mid-twelfth-century code *Leges Edwardi Confessoris* found in the so-called London Collection of the *Quadripartitus* (see Liebermann 1903–16: I, 668, Catto 1981, and Wormald 1999: 237–38),<sup>30</sup> especially given that the *MED* (s.v. *faster-man*) records ME *fasterman* only in this context, and, therefore, we cannot easily explain this usage as a result of linguistic anachronism. If the rubric were attributable to the author of the tract, the selection of the Norse-derived compound could be explained as a result of the fact that s/he seems to have had a special interest in Danelaw idiosyncracies and may actually have composed his/her text in Lincolnshire (see Wormald 1999: 410–11, and O'Brien 1999: 53–61). It is, however, not possible to make this connection, and, therefore, the

<sup>29</sup> On the stylistic features of Old English legal terms, see further Bethurum 1932.

<sup>30</sup> O'Brien does not include the rubric in his recent edition of the text (O'Brien 1999).

use of the compound in this context remains puzzling, although it may be connected with London's character as a linguistic melting-pot.

Besides people, property was also offered as security for one's fulfilment of an obligation, and this leads us to the discussion of OE *nām*. As I have pointed out in an earlier study, the meaning of this term is not fully clear (Pons-Sanz 2007b: 51–53). Bosworth-Toller (Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *nām*) and Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 83) translate it as 'seizure of property belonging to one which is in the hands of another'. This translation makes the term synonymous with OE *ætfeng*, which refers to the attaching of goods, either by the rightful owner whose property is found in someone else's hands or by someone with authority.<sup>31</sup> Clark Hall translates OE *nām* as 'legal seizure' without any further specification (Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *nām*), whereas Robertson (Robertson 1925: 406) and Whitelock (Whitelock 1979: 457) attribute to this term the more specialized meaning 'distrain', which corresponds to Liebermann's (Liebermann 1903–16: III, s.v. *nām*), Hofmann's (Hofmann 1955: §311), and Peters's (Peters 1981: 90) 'Zwangspfand'. The technical sense 'distrain' has much to recommend it.<sup>32</sup> It is fully in keeping with the meanings which Schlyter and Collin assign to its suggested etymon: (1) 'private taking of a pawn which the creditor carries out in the house of the debtor to ensure the payment of or the security for his claim'; (2) 'the possession taken in this way' (*SGL*: XIII, s.v. *nām*).<sup>33</sup> It also associates the term with ME *withernām* 'the distraining of a deforcer's personal goods in order to force restoration of that which he has illegally taken' (see the *MED*: s.v. *withernām*). Furthermore, it makes full sense in the context where the term is used, LawIICn 19: 'And ne

<sup>31</sup> This may be the meaning supported by the *TOE*, but it is not clear because it presents OE *ætfeng*, *nām*, and *nēm* as the head-words for 14.03.03.02.01 'attaching, distraint of stolen property'. The caption is confusing because, as it stands, it suggests that *attaching* and *distrain* should be understood as synonyms, but their meanings are very different (especially when *distrain* is understood in its legal sense; see below, note 32 in this chapter).

<sup>32</sup> The *OED* equates 'the action of distraining' with 'the legal seizure and detention of a chattel, originally for the purpose of thereby constraining the owner to pay money owed by him or to make satisfaction of some wrong done by him' (*OED* 1989: s.vv. *distrain* and *distress*, sense 3).

<sup>33</sup> (1) 'Enskildt uttagande af pant, som en fordringsegare gör hos gäldenären till godtgörande af, l. till sakerhet för sin fordran'; (2) 'det på detta sätt tagna goder'. The glossary included in the last volume of *NGL* attributes to ON *nām* the more general senses 'erhvervelse, besiddelse' ('acquisition, possession'), according to which ON *landnām* refers to the illegitimate seizure of property and the fine to be paid in compensation (e.g. Gul. 81, 85, and 91). This general meaning is present in ME *ofnām* 'a piece of land detached from common land' (cp. OIc *afnām* 'taking away, removal'; see the *MED*: s.v. *ofnām*).

nime nan man nane name ne innan scire ne ut of scire, ær mann hæbbe þriwa on hundrede his rihtes gebeden' ('and no-one shall make distraint of property either in the shire or outside it, until he has demanded his rights three times in the hundred [court]').

The meaning 'distraint' for OE *nām* associates it with the terms which the *TOE* (14.03.03.07) identifies as meaning 'security, pledge, bail', i.e. terms indicating the guarantee which someone has to provide to support his/her case or to show his/her goodwill. Amongst them, the only terms recorded in the Wulfstanian canon, which records the only attestation of the Norse-derived term, are OE *wedd* 'pledge, security' and *borg* id.

As I have noted earlier (Pons-Sanz 2007b: 166), in the Wulfstanian canon these three terms, OE *wedd*, *borg*, and *nām*, appear to express slightly different concepts within this lexico-semantic field: OE *wedd* is a verbal pledge (e.g. LawVAttr 22.1 = LawVIAttr 28 = LawICn 19.1) or the property *handed over* as a pledge (e.g. LawVAttr 1), OE *borg* is the person who acts as surety for someone else (e.g. LawVIIIAttr 27 = LawICn 5.3), and OE *nām* indicates the property *taken* as security. However, outside the Wulfstanian canon the other members of the lexico-semantic field frequently collocate with OE *niman* to indicate the *taking* of something as security (e.g. OE *niman* collocates with OE *inborh* in LawIIew 3.1, with OE *bād* in LawDuns 3, and with OE *underwedd* in Gen 38.18). This suggests that Wulfstan's preference for OE *nām* in LawIICn 19 may respond to the fact that only a noun related to OE *niman* can maintain the alliteration and contribute to the creation of a polyptoton. Thus, we are left with the feeling that other members of the lexico-semantic field could have been used if the stylistic constraints had been different (as is the case in LawVAttr 1, where the disjunctive conjunctions OE *ge ... ge* 'either ... or' coordinate OE *wedd* and *word*).

(C.3) HAVING THE ABILITY TO MAKE LEGAL DECISIONS: ESTABLISHING / OVERTURNING A SENTENCE OF OUTLAWRY (OE *ūtlaga* word-field, *inlagian*, *frīðlēas*, *hlēapan ūt*) AND JUDGING SOMEONE FOR A PARTICULAR CRIME (OE *griðbryce* and *hāmsōcn*)

As in the case of OE *lagu* (see above, 3.4.2.2.A), the first record of OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah* can be found in a text associated with the Scandinavianized areas: viz. Ch 1377 (Rob 37), which is likely to have been drafted in East Anglia (see below, I.54.27 and II.126).<sup>34</sup> However, once OE *lagu* had lost its association

<sup>34</sup> See, however, van Houts 2004: 16 for the theoretical possibility that this usage may date from the mid-twelfth century. Van Houts hypothesizes a context for the original borrowing of



with the Scandinavian newcomers and could refer to any law, OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah*, *ūtlagian*, and *inlagian* could also be used to refer to the legal practices of any area, as well as to practices associated with the religious rather than the secular world (e.g. in Abbot Ælfric's works and the Durham Hymnal Gloss, which shares various lexical traits with the Ælfrician canon; see above, 3.3.3–4, and Milfull 1996: 84–89).<sup>35</sup>

The *TOE* gives only OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah* as the terms meaning 'an outlaw', and OE *(ge)fāh*, *frīðlēas*, and *ūtlah* as the terms meaning 'outlawed, proscribed' (*TOE*: 14.03.03.09.09). It is surprising that the *TOE* does not refer to OE *flȳma*, which is, in fact, the term with which OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah* most clearly overlaps. When discussing this lexico-semantic field, we can leave out OE *(ge)fāh* because its central meaning was 'hostile' or 'in a state of enmity (with someone)', and its use seemingly referring to outlawry, i.e. in constructions such as 'beo he fah wið ðone cyng & wið ealle his freond' (LawIIAs 20.7; 'be he in a state of enmity with the king and all his friends'), is restricted to pre-Æthelredian codes (see the *DOE*: s.vv. *fah*<sup>1</sup>, *fag*<sup>1</sup>, and *gefāh*). Thus, we should focus on the choice between OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah*, *flȳma*, and *frīðlēas*.<sup>36</sup>

The Old English texts seem to present OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah* and *flȳma* as being equivalent, despite the fact that the native term originally meant 'fugitive'. This equivalence is suggested, amongst other things, by the fact that OE *ūtlah* is used in LawIAtr 1.9a in a context where OE *flȳma* had been used in the text which is

the term associated with Scandinavian mercenaries: 'They proved unreliable fellows and easily changed sides. [...] when disloyal they were banned. In a time of heightened tension between old inhabitants and their descendants and newcomers and their offspring when land was under attack and alliances continuously changed, banishment would have been a probably unsuccessful but recurring attempt [...] to punish disloyalty, disobedience, and desertion. And, I would suggest, might it not have been likely that those that were hit by banishment were mostly the Scandinavian newcomers? And might they have come to be known under their Scandinavian label of *utlah*? And could not the frequency of such labelling have led to the label *utlah* being stuck to the pundits and the label *utlaga* [*recte* *ūtlagu*] to the measure of banishment?' (van Houts 2004: 19). While interesting and possible, this hypothesis is difficult to ascertain.

<sup>35</sup> From this perspective, it is not necessary to agree with van Houts that the use of OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah* in *I Æthelred* responds to an attempt to discourage the 'long established Danes in that area from imitating the newcomers' (van Houts 2004: 19) with regard to disloyalty and disobedience (cp. note 34 in this chapter).

<sup>36</sup> On the relationship between these terms and the OE *nīðing* word-field, see above, 3.4.2.2.B. Given that, as noted above, 3.4.2.2.A, OE *lagu* in the Wulfstanian texts refers to both secular and religious laws, OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah* are also used in religious contexts, where they act as equivalent to OE *āmānsumad* 'excommunicated' (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 80–82).



the source of the Æthelredian decree, i.e. LawIIAs 2.1 (see van Houts 2004: 16 and n. 13). Their equivalence is also suggested by their uses in the Wulfstanian canon, where the (near)synonyms are treated as equivalent, albeit with different collocational patterns: OE *flyma* tends to collocate, as in pre-Wulfstanian legal codes, with verbs associated with harbouring or feeding (e.g. OE *habban*, *fēdan*, *feormian*), whereas OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah* tends to collocate instead with the verb OE *bēon* ‘to be’ (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 82).

Given Wulfstan’s preference for OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah* and *flyma*, the selection of OE *frīðlēas* in LawIICn 15a is very interesting. It is used as an equivalent of OE *flyma*, because it collocates with OE *healdan* ‘to maintain’ and *feormian* ‘to harbour’: ‘and gyf hwa þāne frīðleasan man healde oððe feormie, bete þæt swa hit ær lagu wæs’ (‘if anyone then maintains or harbours an outlaw, he should pay compensation for it as the law was before’). Indeed, the equivalence of the two terms must have been noticed by the scribe of London, British Library Cotton, MS Nero A.i, because the text in that manuscript reads instead ‘frīðleasan man healde oððe flyman feormie’. While we can only speculate about the reasons that may have led Wulfstan to use (and most probably (re)coin) OE *frīðlēas*, we may feel tempted to associate its presence with the use of the semantic loan OE *frīð* in LawIICn 13 (see below, 3.4.2.2.D).<sup>37</sup>

In post-Wulfstanian texts, OE *flyma* continues to be used together with the Norse-derived complexes OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah*, although there is an increasing tendency towards the use of the latter. For instance, van Houts (van Houts 2004: 17 n. 19) notes that between 1017 and 1097 the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* manuscripts contain OE *ūtlah* (and variants) eight times but OE *flyma* and variants only twice.<sup>38</sup> Even though during the Middle English period the reflex of OE *flyma*, ME *flēme*, continues to be used, the predominance of ME *outlaue* is clear, and the native term seems to have become obsolete by the end of the period (see the *MED*: s.v. *flēme*, n.1 and adj., and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *fleme*, n.1).

The increasing use of the Norse-derived complexes should probably be associated with the popularity of OE *lagu* both in legal and non-legal texts, because, by seemingly belonging to the same word-field as the simplex (see

<sup>37</sup> The fact that OE *frīðlēas* meaning ‘outlawed’ was uncommon may be suggested by its replacement with OE *frēondlēas* in the Latin versions of the law (*Instituta Cnuti* and *De foresta*); see the *DOE*: s.v. *frēondlēas* sense 1.b.

<sup>38</sup> OE *flyma*, though, is the only term used when referring to the harbouring of fugitives and outlaws (OE *flymanfeorm* ‘right to the fine due from one who harboured a fugitive from the law’). This might be attributable to the generally conservative character of the legal language (cp. Mellinkoff 1963: 12–13).

above, 2.4.1.E), they (together with OE *ūtlagu*, *ūtlagian*, and *inlagian*, on which see below) can express one's position within the legal society much more clearly than terms belonging to different word-fields. It is therefore not surprising, for instance, that L *extorris* 'exiled, banished' is glossed by OE *ūtlaga* in AldV 1 (Goossens) 374 = AldV 13.1 (Nap) 275, given that Fischer (A. Fischer 1989: 111) notes that OE *lagu* and not OE *æ* is used in the Aldhelmian glosses to render L *ius* 'right, justice, law', *lex* 'law', and *scitum* 'decree'. However, we cannot easily say that the popularity of the complexes relies only on that of the simplex because, for instance, the so-called Durham Hymnal prefers OE *æ* to OE *lagu* when rendering L *lex* (e.g. HyGl 2 (Milfull) 58.2 and 77.4), but OE *ūtlaga* is the term that renders the three occurrences of L *exul* 'banished person, outlaw' (HyGl 2 (Milfull) 3.8, 13.3, and 48.2). Similarly, Ælfric renders L *exlex* 'outlaw' in his grammar not only as OE *ūtlaga*, but also as OE *butan æ* (ÆGram 70.5 and 276.7).

The *TOE* gives the Norse-derived OE *ūtlagu*, *ūtlagian*, and *inlagian* as the only terms meaning 'outlawry', 'to outlaw', and 'to reverse the sentence of outlawry', respectively (*TOE*: 14.03.03.09.03). Although OIc *útlegð* 'banishment, exile' and *útlegja* 'to banish' are recorded, the English complexes are likely to be native new formations on the basis of OE *lagu* and *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah*. It is therefore probable that they were coined when the other members of their word-field (and perceived word-field) were well integrated in their respective lexico-semantic fields and were gaining popularity. Notice, for instance, that OE *ūtlagu* is first attested in Ch Peterbor (Rob 40), a document which has been associated from a chronological perspective with Ælfric's corpus, where OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah* and *ūtlagian* are already recorded (see above, 3.3.3, and below, I.54.27–29); OE *inlagian* is first recorded in the Wulfstanian canon, where the OE *lagu* word-field plays a prominent role (see above, 3.3.4, and below, I.54.5).

Outlawry refers to the fact that an individual loses the legal protection granted by the society s/he is part of. From that perspective, the specialized meaning of OE *hlēapan ūt* in ChronD (Cubbin) 1072.1 = ChronE (Irvine) 1071.1, i.e. 'to get out of the peace and protection granted by the social community one is immersed in and turn against its representative', brings the expression very close to the Old English outlawry terminology, as the act it refers to could be considered to lead to voluntary outlawry. While there is a significant number of Old English verbs with the meaning 'to depart hurriedly, flee' (see the *TOE*: 05.12.05.03.03), the closest native equivalents to this verbal phrase seem to have been OE *flēon*, which could mean 'to flee' or maybe even 'to go into banishment' (see the *DOE*: s.v. *flēon*), and OE *āsceacan*, which could mean 'to escape, flee' and 'to desert' (see the *DOE*: s.v. *āsceacan*; cp. the

*TOE*: 05.12.05.03.03). However, given the specialized sense of the Norse-derived phrase, it seems better to consider the native verbs as superordinates, rather than (near)synonyms, of the Norse-derived phrase. Therefore, the use of the Norse-derived phrase could be attributable to the possibility it offers to be much more specific than the native terms would allow for, as well as to dialectal lexical differences, the only attestations of the expression with the Norse-derived meaning being restricted to a couple of annals associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see above, 3.3.6, and below, I.46).

OE *griðbryce* and *hāmsōcn* should also be described in this section referring to the ability to make legal decisions. While the actual crime referred to by OE *hāmsōcn* and its relationship with OE *hūsbyrce* are not clear (see above, 3.4.2.2.B), it is certainly the case that the exocentric interpretation of the compounds (i.e. the reference to the privilege to judge whatever the exact crimes may have been and to receive the fine to be paid for them) is much more common in late Old English and early Middle English texts. This is clearly the result of the impact of the wording in Ch 986 (Harm 28) on legal phraseology. The text includes OE *hāmsōcn* and OE *griðbryce* in the list of royal privileges which the king could grant to someone (cp. LawIICn 12 and 15),<sup>39</sup> and this Cnutian charter seems to have started a trend in legal terminology, facilitated by the formulaic character of the latter (see further Pons-Sanz 2007b: 150–53, 170–71, and 237–39).

#### (C.4) FORA FOR MAKING LEGAL DECISIONS: ASSEMBLY (OE *hūsting*)

Pantos notes that, on the basis of the wide range of contexts where OE *gemōt* appears, ‘it was the usual word for any sort of meeting or gathering, regardless of size, purpose or importance’ (Pantos 2004: 182). Indeed, of the native members of the lexico-semantic field (the *TOE*: 12.02.02 also mentions OE *gemang*, (ge)samnung, werod, ymbcyme),<sup>40</sup> OE (ge)mōt is the only one to be attested in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, including the so-called *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut* (ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1015 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1015 = ChronE (Irvine) 1015 and ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1020 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1020 = ChronE (Irvine) 1020), where OE *hūsting* is recorded once (see above, 3.3.4, and below, I.51.1.B).

<sup>39</sup> LawIICn 15 presents OE *griðbryce* as synonymous with OE *mundbryce* in LawIICn 12, where the native term rather than the Norse-derived term may have been used because of the reliance of this decree on LawIIEm 6 (see below, 3.4.2.2.D, and Pons-Sanz 2007b: 150–53).

<sup>40</sup> On OE *ðing* and *mædel* as members of this lexico-semantic field, see Pantos 2004 and above, 2.4.1.D.

The semantic relationship between the two terms is not fully clear. The *gemōt* mentioned in the aforementioned annals of the *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut* is likely to have had a political and possibly legal character: Blair suggests that the meeting probably represented 'an abortive attempt to reunite England after Swein's invasion' (Blair 1998: 159). The same cannot be easily said about the *hūsting* referred to in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1012 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1012 = ChronE (Irvine) 1012 = ChronF (Baker) 1012. The *OED* translates the term in this context as 'assembly for deliberative purposes' (*OED* 1989: s.v. *husting*), and this would bring it closer to the Norse-derived terms belonging to the lexico-semantic field of communion (Group H; see above, 3.2.3). However, McDougall (McDougall 1993: 221) hypothesizes that the term may actually have here the same meaning as in later sources, i.e. 'court or tribunal' (cp. Ch 1465 (Rob 86)), and that Bishop Ælfheah may have been judged and ritually executed in the *hūsting*. If this is the case, OE *gemōt* and *hūsting* may differ on two accounts. On the one hand, the latter may have been culturally associated with the Scandinavians and their activities, whereas OE *gemōt* did not have such association; this suggestion, though, is not beyond doubt. As pointed out above, 2.4.1.D, Nightingale (Nightingale 1987) would like to see the two attestations of OE *hūsting* in Old English as closely connected with the Scandinavian newcomers. While its use in the *Chronicle* may be the result of an attempt to highlight the foreign character of those involved in the atrocious murder of Archbishop Ælfheah, its use in connection with London's administrative and judicial assembly in Ch 1465 (Rob 86) and later texts may be explained as a result of Danish activities in that city in the early years of Cnut's reign. These suggestions certainly offer a very good explanation for the use of the term; however, we cannot forget that Nightingale's explanation of the use of OE *hūsting* for the London assembly relies on the assumed Norse-derived character of the term and, hence, using this evidence to suggest a connection between the term and the Scandinavians is clearly circular (see above, 2.4.1.D). As in the case of the other terms discussed in this section, Middle English evidence cannot help much. The use of the term in early Middle English, leaving aside references to London's assembly, is restricted to Lazamon's *Brut* (see the *MED*: s.v. *hūsting*), which shares a significant number of Norse-derived terms with the D-version of the *Chronicle* (see Dance 2003: 191–92). Nightingale (Nightingale 1987: 562) explains that from the thirteenth century we see the use of the compound in connection with local assemblies other than London, but this usage was most likely a copy of the London terminology.

On the other hand, while OE *gemōt* did not necessarily have a technical meaning and could refer to meetings or assemblies as varied as the Last

Judgement or physical combats (see Pantos 2004: 181–82), OE *hūsting* may have only belonged to the legal technolēct, and the more general meaning ‘council or assembly called on a special occasion by a king or other leader’ (see the *MED*: s.v. *hūsting*) may be a later semantic development. Alternatively, though, this general meaning may have already been present during the Old English period and may not be recorded (or it may be recorded in the *Chronicle* context).

**(C.5) TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION: SUBDIVISION OF A SHIRE (OE *wāpentac*)**

The twelfth-century code *Leges Edwardi Confessoris* (30.1) presents OE *wāpentac* as fully equivalent to OE *hundred*: ‘quod Angli vocant hundredum, supradicti comitatus vocant wapentagium’ (‘what the Angles call *hundred*, the aforementioned shires [i.e. Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, Leicestershire, and Northamptonshire up to Watling Street] call *wapentake*’) (see O’Brien 1999: 188–89). This is indeed the opinion generally held by Anglo-Saxon historians (see, for instance, Loyn 1984: ch. 6): when dealing with the difference between OE *hundred* and *wāpentac* in late Anglo-Saxon England, we are dealing, not with a semantic difference, but merely with a lexical difference associated with dialectal variation, for the Norse-derived term appears in Domesday Book in connection with the Five Boroughs, Northamptonshire, and Yorkshire (see above, 1.3.1, 3.3.2–3, and 3.3.5–6; cp. the *MED*: *wāpentake*). Both terms could refer to (1) a territorial division of the shire, which Keynes defines as ‘a district, in most cases conceived as a part of a larger whole, which served as a unit or organising principle of local government for military, legislative, financial and other administrative purposes’ (Keynes 1999a: 420) (see e.g. LawIIIAttr 3.2 and 3.4); and (2) the court operating in that territory (see e.g. LawIIIAttr 1.2). Loyn (Loyn 1984: 144) hypothesizes that there was probably little difference between hundred and wapentake courts in procedural matters, although it may also be the case that the Scandinavianized areas introduced some ‘precocious experiments’, such as the twelve-person jury or the significance of a majority verdict (see, however, further Turner 1968 and Stanley 2000: Part II).

**(D) LEGAL RIGHTS: RIGHT TO RECEIVE AND GRANT PEACE AND PROTECTION (OE *frið* and the *grið* word-field)**

McKinney conducted a study of the four main Old English terms (and their respective word-fields) meaning ‘peace’ and ‘protection’: OE *borg*, *mund*, *frið*, and *grið* (McKinney 1994). This section will focus on the meaning ‘the legal right to either receive or grant peace and protection’; 3.4.2.2.E.2 focuses on the meaning ‘agreement to end violent hostility’.

Of the terms discussed by McKinney, the members of the OE *borg* word-field are clearly the least central terms in the lexico-semantic fields he focuses on, because they are more commonly used in connection with the meanings 'security' (see above, 3.4.2.2.C.2) and 'loan', and they only mean 'protection' in 5 per cent of their occurrences (McKinney 1994: 132). All the contexts where they have that meaning discuss breach of protection, and interestingly, they are confined to Alfred's lawcode (LawAf 1 3–3.2) and to *II Cnut* (LawIICn 58–58.2), where the wording clearly follows the Alfredian decrees (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 153–54). Therefore, it could be argued that, by the time OE *grið* started to be used, OE *borg* meaning 'protection' had become almost obsolete, and accordingly, this term can be left out of the discussion below.

The members of the OE *mund* word-field, on the other hand, have some kind of 'protection' sense in 90 per cent of their occurrences in the *OEC* (see McKinney 1994: 130), which makes them more comparable to the members of the OE *frið* and *grið* word-fields. However, it is noticeable that 60 per cent of the occurrences of the OE *mund* word-field with the 'protection' meaning outside glosses can be found in non-legal texts, particularly in poetic and religious texts, while most of the members of the OE *grið* word-field occur in legal and historical documents. Liebermann (Liebermann 1903–16: II, s.v. *Schutz*, 3.a) explains that OE *mund* and *grið* tend to differ as well in that the native term can refer to 'the right of peace and protection enjoyed by any free person' (cp. LawAbt 15), while OE *grið* tends to be associated instead with the protection enjoyed by special entities. These terms do overlap in the Wulfstanian canon, though, where the OE *mund* word-field is most frequently used in connection with the special protection of some institutions, and this brings it very close to the OE *grið* word-field (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 146–50). Besides 'protection', OE *mund*, as a feminine noun, could also mean 'protector' and the 'fixed fine for the breach of protection' (see McKinney 1994: ch. 2), and, actually, this seems to be the main difference between this noun and OE *grið* in Wulfstan's works, because the latter does not have the agentive or monetary meaning (cp. below, 4.3).

While trying to establish the meaning of OE *unfrið*, Fell (Fell 1982–85) studied the use of OE *frið* and *grið* in Old English texts and reached the conclusion that the two terms could be said to operate as interchangeable synonyms. Fell's argument contradicts the traditional view that, with the introduction of the Norse-derived term, the lexico-semantic field underwent a process of reorganization by which OE *frið* meant 'general peace or protection', while OE *grið* continued to be used as in Old Norse to refer to a temporarily or locally restricted peace or protection. Fell's view, however, requires further analysis. It



is clearly not accurate for the Wulfstanian compositions, which record approximately 70 per cent of the uses of the *grið* word-field in Old English (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 235–39, and below, I.39). In these texts OE *grið* and the compounds with the Norse-derived term as one of their components are used in connection with a temporarily restricted peace or protection, or with the peace and protection enjoyed or granted by special institutions or social groups, while the members of the native word-field tend to indicate rather ‘peace or protection in general’. The distinction between the two word-fields, though, is blurred as far as the verbs OE *frīðian* and *griðian* are concerned; their use in the Wulfstanian corpus seems to have been dictated by echoic effects rather than semantic differences (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 125–46).

Interestingly, there is one context in the Wulfstanian corpus where OE *frīð* has a more restricted meaning than ‘peace or protection in general’. As indicated above (2.5.H), OE *frīð* in LawIICn 13 seems to mean ‘the right to protection granted by the legal society where one is immersed’, which is a meaning more clearly associated with OIc *fríðr* than OE *frīð*. It is worthwhile repeating the context where the term appears: ‘& se ðe utlages weorc gewyrce, wealde se cingc þæs friþes’. The presence of ‘utlages weorc’ may give us a clue as to the appearance of OE *frīð* with the Norse-derived meaning and, possibly, OE *frīðlēas* in LawIICn 15a (see above, 3.4.2.2.C.3). Old English legal texts do not tend to use OE *weorc* ‘work, deed’ premodified by a term referring to a criminal in the genitive to indicate a crime (the closest wording is ‘niðinges dæde’ (‘the deed of an outlaw’) in LawWal 1), whereas *gōra útлага verk* ‘to commit an outlaw’s deed’ is not uncommon in Old Norse texts (see Cleasby and Vigfusson 1957: s.v. *útlagi*). It could therefore be the case that the decree, packed with Norse-derived expressions and views, relies heavily on the Scandinavian laws with which Cnut and many of his aidmen would have been familiar. This reliance would certainly explain the uncommon expression ‘utlages weorc’, and the otherwise unattested meaning of OE *frīð*. The use of OE *frīð* in this context with the Norse-derived meaning could have then contributed to the use of OE *frīðlēas* (rather than the expected OE *flýma*) just a few lines below, given that the root in that derivative has the same meaning as the simplex in LawIICn 13.

In the later annals of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* we also seem to find a distinction between the members of the OE *grið* and *frīð* word-fields: there are frequent references to the protection or security guaranteed by someone and to temporary or local protection, and those meanings are more often than not expressed by OE *grið* (see, for instance, ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1041 and 1055 and ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1 for the first meaning, but cf. OE *frīð* in



ChronE (Irvine) 1095; and ChronE (Irvine) 1046b and 1048 for the second one). OE *frīð*, on the other hand, is used in references to public law and order (and the general peace and protection that such situation grants individuals; e.g. ChronE (Irvine) 1086). As in the case of the lexico-semantic field discussed in 3.4.2.2.E.2, only the OE *frīð* word-field participates in word-formation processes in the *Chronicle*, though: notice, for instance, OE *frīðstōl* ‘sanctuary’, meaning specifically ‘winter quarters of the Viking army’ in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1006 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1006 = ChronE (Irvine) 1006.<sup>41</sup> The general difference in usage between OE *grīð* and *frīð* in the annals could be taken as evidence in favour of the traditional differentiation of the terms (see above), or it could be attributable to the influence of Wulfstanian usage (cp. the coordination of OE *grīðian* and *frīðian* in ChronE (Irvine) 1093 in the very Wulfstanian sounding ‘Godes cyrcean grīðian and frīðian’), the two options not being mutually exclusive.

Given the existence of the OE *frīð* and *mund* word-fields, it is remarkable that the OE *grīð* word-field became such an important part of the Old English legal technolact. It is not clear whether its first attestations can be exclusively associated with the Scandinavianized areas: given the problems involved in dating LawIIEm 7.1 (see below, II.205), *III Æthelred* or *The Battle of Maldon* may record the first uses of OE *grīð*, and only the former is clearly connected with the Scandinavianized areas (see below, II.13.1.5 and 4.2.4, respectively). In any case, the records of the members of the field during the eleventh and early twelfth centuries (see above, 3.3.4–6) make it clear that any possible initial association of the terms with the Scandinavianized areas was very soon forgotten. The echoic character of OE *frīð* and *grīð* may have contributed to the initial adoption of the Norse-derived term, while the important role of the OE *grīð* word-field in Wulfstan’s works, which had a significant impact on later legal and historical texts (cp. Pons-Sanz 2007a: ch. 8; see also above, 3.4.2.2.C.3), is likely to have contributed to a great extent to the integration of the field in the legal technolact.

<sup>41</sup> Cp. OE *frīðgeard* ‘sanctuary, enclosure of protection for a fugitive’ (LawNorthu 54), *frīðsōcn* ‘sanctuary, asylum’ (LawICn 2.3) and *frīðsplott* ‘sanctuary’ (WCan 1.1.1. 16). Even Wulfstanian compositions record these compounds, which refer to some protection of a limited character. Their use could be attributable, at least partially, to the conservative nature of the legal language (see above, note 38 in this chapter) and to the fact that OE *frīðstōl* and *frīðstōw* were clearly the traditionally preferred terms to refer to a sanctuary and the privilege of sanctuary.

## (E) MAKING AN AGREEMENT

(E.1) AN AGREEMENT (OE *māl* word-field) AND ITS CONDITIONS (OE *cost*)

As noted above, 3.4.2.2.C.1, OE *māl* has a wide range of meanings. When meaning ‘agreement’ (viz. ChronE (Irvine) 1086 and Rec 8.2 (RobApp I 2)), it should be associated with OE *formāl(a)* / *formæl* and the terms which the *TOE* (14.04) gives as meaning ‘agreement, compact, treaty’, i.e. OE (*ge*)*cwide*, *forespræc*, *foreweard*, *forewyrð*, *næming*, *seht*, *geðinge*, and *wær*. These terms differ from OE *grið*, which the *TOE* does not mention in this context, in that the latter, when associated with the the lexico-semantic field under discussion, tends to refer to an agreement leading to the (temporary) cessation of war and strife between the parties involved (see below, 3.4.2.2.E.2), while violent confrontation is not necessarily present as far as the other terms are concerned.

Amongst the terms recorded by the *TOE*, the core members of the lexico-semantic field seem to have been OE *foreweard* and *forewyrð*, which could mean both ‘agreement’ and ‘the specific terms and conditions of the agreement’ (OE *foreword* is also very common, but it means only ‘terms, conditions of the agreement’; see the *DOE*: s.v. *foreword*). OE *māl*, on the other hand, appears to have been a peripheral term, being recorded only twice in the corpus with the meaning ‘terms and conditions of an agreement’.<sup>42</sup>

This peripheral position is shared by all the other members of the word-field belonging to this lexico-semantic field. OE *formæl* / *formāl(a)* ‘agreement, treaty’ is only recorded twice, once in clear connection with the Scandinavian newcomers (viz. LawIIAtr 1; see below, II.13.1.4), and once in a text whose date and dialectal origin remain difficult to establish, although its lexical choice may have been somehow associated with that in the Ætheldredian text (viz. LawSwær 1; see below, I.58.1 and II.218). OE *fridmāl* ‘peace agreement, article of peace’ has its native (near)synonym in OE *fridgewrit* (see the *TOE*: 13.01.01.01). These terms are only recorded once in the *OEC* (LawIIAtr 0.1 and LawIIEw 5.2, respectively; see below, I.58.2), the attestation of OE *fridmāl* being clearly associated with the Scandinavianized areas. OE *fridmāl* in LawIIAtr 0.1 is coordinated with OE *foreword*, which seems to suggest that the determinatum of the compound (viz. OE *māl*) should here be interpreted as well as meaning ‘terms and conditions of an agreement’.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>42</sup> The block of annals in the E-manuscript of the *Chronicle* with which ChronE (Irvine) 1086 can be associated records OE *foreweard* (ChronE (Irvine) 1103) with the general meaning ‘agreement, covenant’, but we cannot infer that these annals establish a semantic distinction between the two terms because of their problematic authorship (see below, II.163.21).

<sup>43</sup> On OE *māldeg* ‘agreement, covenant’, see below, 3.4.2.2.E.2.

Thus, OE *māl* seems to have occasionally overlapped with OE *cost*, which has two main meanings: ‘condition’ and ‘way, manner, course of action’, under which the *DOE* (s.v. *cost*, noun2) also includes ‘option’; the latter meanings are dealt with below, in 3.4.2.10.B.1. OE *cost* meaning ‘condition’ is recorded in Wulfstan’s *Institutes of Polity* and in King Æthelred’s confirmation of Æthelric’s will (Ch 939 (Whitelock 16.2)), neither of which is associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see above, 2.5.C, 3.3.2, and 3.3.4, and below, II.257). The *TOE* (14.04.02) tells us that when it has that meaning, OE *cost* overlaps with OE *ārædnes*, *foreweard*, *for(e)word*, *forewyrð*, *gerād*, *(ge)ræden*, *(ge)rædnes*, and *(ge)ðinge*. From these, we could discount as its (near)synonyms OE *ārædnes*, whose use seems to have been very limited (it is only recorded in the Old English translation to Bede’s *Ecclesiastical History of the English Nation*), OE *(ge)ræden*, which is not often recorded in legal texts, OE *(ge)rædnes*, which is most commonly used with the meaning ‘ordinance, decree, resolution’, and OE *(ge)ðinge*, which is not commonly used in legal texts with the meaning ‘a condition appointed to a person’ (see Toller 1921: s.v. *geþinge*). It seems then that OE *cost* in the sense under discussion here had amongst its native equivalents mainly OE *foreweard*, *forewyrð*, and, to a lesser extent, *for(e)word* (it does not appear to have been as frequently used as the other two to indicate ‘condition, proviso’). In fact, OE *forewyrð* appears in Wulfstan’s *Institutes of Polity* in the next paragraph to that containing OE *cost* (viz. WPol 6.1 (Jost) 17).

On the basis of the Old English attestations and the fact that ME *cost* is not recorded with the meaning under consideration (cf. ME *fōrewārd*; see the *MED*: s.v. *fōrewārd*, sense 3.c), we can conclude that, while OE *cost* was accepted as a term belonging to the legal technolact, it was not the core term in the lexico-semantic field to express the meaning under discussion.<sup>44</sup> Changes in the sociopolitical and legal spheres due to the Norman Conquest could be the reason why the term did not continue to be used in this (less common) meaning (note, though, that ME *condicioun* in the legal sense ‘stipulation, proviso’ is first recorded c. 1350; see the *MED*: s.v. *condicioun*).

(E.2) SPECIFIC TYPES OF AGREEMENT: BUSINESS AGREEMENT (OE *fēolaga* word-field, *mund and māldeg*, and *brýðhlōp*), AGREEMENT TO END VIOLENT HOSTILITY (OE *grið* word-field), CONTRACT OF (MILITARY) SERVICE, WAGES (OE *māl*)

Old English texts record various Norse-derived terms referring to two main types of business agreements: business partnerships, the lexico-semantic sub-

<sup>44</sup> On the legal character of the *Institutes of Polity* and its aims, see Trilling 2007.

field which is analysed first, and wedding agreements. The *TOE* (12.04.01) gives OE *efening*, *fēolaga*, *gefēra*, *gegada*, *gehlyt(t)a*, and *gewita* as (near)synonyms and attributes to them the meanings ‘partner, colleague’. There is, however, a clear semantic difference between the native terms and the Norse-derived compound. Amongst the native terms, only OE *gewita* seems to have been part of the legal technolact, and when used in a legal sense, it most often means ‘accomplice’ (particularly of theft; e.g. *LawIne* 7.2, *LawICn* 5.3, etc). In contrast, OE *fēolaga* appears to have generally retained the original association of its etymon with business transactions (see Jesch 2001b: 232), therefore meaning ‘business partner’ rather than more generally ‘companion’ or ‘colleague’,<sup>45</sup> and, similarly, the derivative OE *fēolagscipe* clearly means ‘business partnership’. Therefore, their use in Old English could be attributed in the main to the fact that they allow for the expression of a more specialized type of relationship. However, we cannot forget either that the choice of these terms might have also been triggered by dialectal lexical differences. Despite their Anglicized form (see above, 2.4.2.I), all the attestations of OE *fēolaga* and *fēolagscipe* in Old English texts are associated with the Scandinavian newcomers or the areas where they settled. Although OE *fēolaga* is recorded in Winchester, *Inscr* 52 (Ok 138) refers to some people who probably came from Scandinavia (see above, the second footnote to Table 8, page 136), and *ChronD* (Cubbin) 1016 is likely to record the terminology used by the two sides entering an Anglo-Scandinavian agreement near Deerhurst, viz. OE *wedbrōðor* (on which see below, III.4.CCCC) and *fēolaga* (see below, II.163.13).

The presence of the word-field in early Middle English texts from the South-West Midlands (see Dance 2003: 351) may suggest that the terms had ceased to be exclusively associated with the Scandinavians and the areas where they settled earlier than the extant records would allow us to see. However, it may also be the case that the use of OE *fēolaga* in the D-version of the *Chronicle* contributed to the familiarity of the word-field in the area (cp. Dance 2003: 300–04). In any case, it is clear that during the Middle English period the word-field no longer exhibits an exclusive association with the Scandinavians and their areas of settlement. This dialectal expansion came together with a process of semantic generalization, for the use of the terms was no longer restricted to the business and legal spheres (see Rynell 1948: 361, and the *MED*: s.vv. *fēlaue*, and *fēlaushipe*). The more restricted meaning was in the main taken over by the ME *parcēner* / *partenēre* word-fields (see the *MED*: s.vv. *parcēner*, sense d, and *partēnere*, sense 2.b).

<sup>45</sup> The meaning of the term in the Roman-alphabet inscription in Winchester, viz. *Inscr* 52 (Ok 138), remains unclear, though; see Jesch 2001b: 235.

The discussion of terms referring to marriage in connection with business agreements might seem somewhat surprising to the modern reader, but we need to remember that cultural views regarding the social institution of marriage have changed significantly since Anglo-Saxon times, when, as Fischer notes, 'marriage remained a business deal' (A. Fischer 1986: 19–20; cp. Ch 1459 (Rob 76)). This is the reason why the Norse-derived terms associated with the two stages of what Fischer (A. Fischer 1986) calls 'marriage by purchase' (i.e. the type of marriage where the bride was not abducted by her future husband), viz. the engagement and the wedding, are discussed as part of the legal terminology rather than together with non-technical terms referring to social interaction.

Fischer (A. Fischer 1986: 20) notes that an Anglo-Saxon marriage was connected with a number of financial transactions: the money paid for the bride to her guardian or to the bride herself, earnest money (paid on the occasion of the engagement), and the institutions of dowry and morning-gift. Larson explains that the Scandinavian term which is generally given as the source for the monetary sense of OE *mund* under consideration here referred to 'a sum of money, or its equivalent in chattels or land, that was paid at the nuptials by the bridegroom when he received the bride' (Larson 1935: 422). Thus, OE *mund* in the formula *mund and mǣldæg* seems to refer to the first of the sums of money outlined by Fischer (i.e. the brideprice; see Goody 1983: 244), which is variously referred to in Old English texts as OE *cēap*, *feoh*, *yrfe*, and *sceatt* (see Liebermann 1903–16: II, 369, A. Fischer 1986: 20, and Klinck 2007). The native terms have a rather more general meaning than the semantic loan, because they are variously associated with property and wealth. Similarly, in Old English texts there does not seem to exist a term which, like OE *mǣldæg* in the aforementioned alliterating formula, refers to an agreement between the future spouses regarding succession to property after the death of one of them. Thus, the choice of the Norse-derived formula may respond to an attempt to use highly specialized vocabulary, but its selection should also be associated with dialectal lexical practices, the formula being only recorded in a document from East Anglia, viz. Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) (see below, I.58.4 and II.156). In fact, despite the opportunity for semantic specialization they offer, the Norse-derived terms in the formula seem to have been fairly peripheral in their fields, for neither of them is recorded in Middle English texts.

Monetary transactions were not the only component of a marriage agreement in Anglo-Scandinavian times; the actual wedding ceremony was also very important. Fischer (A. Fischer 1986: 22) explains that the wedding would consist of various activities: the bride would be given away to the groom at her guardian's house, the groom would lead her to his own house, and the pair

would entertain the guests at a wedding party. The wedding would be concluded by the wedding night, the beginning of which was also part of the whole ceremony. On the basis of its lexical components (see above, 2.2.1.2.A), OE *brúðlaup* is likely to have referred originally to the second component, i.e. the bride's 'transfer' to her new home. However, as is the case with the originally (near)synonymous Old English nouns (viz. OE *hæman*, *hæmed*, and *lāc* compounds; see A. Fischer 1986: 23), its Old English reflex does not exhibit that specialized meaning, and it is used rather more loosely to mean 'wedding' or 'wedding celebration'. Thus, in all its occurrences in the Aldredian glosses (see below, I.8.1) it renders L *nuptiae* 'marriage, wedding, nuptials', and this is also the Latin term in the section of the Waverley Annals which refers to the wedding feast mentioned in ChronD (Cubbin) 1076 = ChronE (Irvine) 1075 (see Luard 1864–69: II, 192–93, and below).

In ChronD (Cubbin) 1076 the Norse-derived compound is presented as a synonym of the native OE *brýðealu* (see below, 4.2.1), while Aldred uses the term either as the only gloss for the Latin lemma or as one of the members of a double gloss, the other member being OE *færm* / *feorm* (MtGl (Li) 22.2) or *hæmed* (JnArgGl (Li) 2). Even in the Aldredian corpus, though, OE *brýðhlöp* does not seem to have been the core member of the lexico-semantic field: as noted by Fischer (A. Fischer 1986: 50), his work on the Lindisfarne Gospels includes only six examples of the Norse-derived term as opposed to thirteen instances of OE *færm* / *feorm* (as well as three cases of OE *hæmed* and one each of OE *gereord* and *symbel*), while his glosses to the Durham Ritual record no examples of the Norse-derived term and eight of the native OE *gēmunng*, which Fischer identifies as 'the oldest and most frequent Anglian word for "wedding"' (A. Fischer 1986: 48) (see further below, 4.3.1). Indeed, the Norse-derived term seems to have been a fairly rare and dialectally restricted term (see below, 4.2.1). Its apparent rarity is further suggested by the fact that it does not seem to have survived much after the Norman Conquest.<sup>46</sup> Middle English texts, even those from the Scandinavianized areas, prefer other terms to refer to a wedding: e.g. the *Ormulum* and *Cursor Mundi* record ME *brīdāle* (< OE *brýðealu*), while *Pearl* prefers the deverbal noun ME *weddyng* (see the MED: s.vv. *brīd-āle*, *weddyng*; cp. J. Coleman 1999: 382–83).

Moving on to various types of military agreements, we will first focus on agreements to end violent hostility, which are commonly referred to in the

<sup>46</sup> We should note, though, that Owun was also happy to use OE *brýðhlöp* on two occasions where he might have encountered it in his exemplar (cp. LkGl (Li) 17.27 and LkGl (Li) 20.34; see further below, 4.2.3).



*Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* by members of the OE *grið* word-field. This corpus differs from Wulfstan's works with regard to both the meaning and lexical productivity of the members of the OE *grið* word-field (see above, 3.4.2.2.D). We see these differences most clearly in the so-called *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut* (i.e. ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 983–1022 = ChronD (Cubbin) 983–1022 = ChronE (Irvine) 983–1022; see below, II.163.6):

- (1) Semantic differences between Wulfstan's works and the *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut*:
  - (a) In the Wulfstanian corpus the OE *grið* and *frið* word-fields are used mainly to refer to an individual's or institution's right to peace or protection, while in the annals under consideration OE *grið* and *frið* refer to peace agreements or truces.
  - (b) In the Wulfstanian corpus OE *grið* and *frið* are fairly clearly differentiated, while in the annals under consideration they are used interchangeably and can, occasionally, be found as coordinated synonyms (e.g. ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1011 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1011 = ChronE (Irvine) 1011).<sup>47</sup>
  - (c) In the Wulfstanian corpus OE *griðian* and *friðian* are near-synonyms, while in the annals this is not the case: only OE *griðian* tends to express the meaning 'to make peace or a truce (with someone)'; OE *friðian* is only recorded with that meaning once (see the *DOE*: s.v. *friðian*), viz. ChronF (Baker) 1004, clearly as a later modification of the original OE *cēapian friðes* (see ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1004 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1004 = ChronE (Irvine) 1004).
- (2) Differences in word-formation processes between Wulfstan's works and the *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut*: while the Wulfstanian corpus records a significant number of compounds with OE *grið* as one of their components, all the complexes recorded in the annals except for OE *griðian* belong to the OE *frið* word-field, regardless of whether they refer to peace agreements (e.g. OE *friðāð* 'oath of peace between two hostile parties' in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1012 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1012 = ChronE (Irvine) 1012), general peace or lack thereof (e.g. OE *unfrið* 'hostility' in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 994 = ChronD (Cubbin) 994 = ChronE (Irvine) 994; cp. OE *friðstōl* in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1006 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1006 = ChronE (Irvine) 1006). Some of them may be

<sup>47</sup> Cp. Mald 35, 39, and 41; on the lexical similarities between *The Battle of Maldon* and the *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut*, see below, 4.2.4.



nonce words (e.g. OE *friðāð*, *unfriðhere* ‘hostile army’, and *unfriðflota* ‘hostile fleet’), while others are well attested in the *OEC* (e.g. OE *unfrið*). OE *grið* does not take part in similar word-formation processes.

These trends continue in the later annals of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*: e.g. a peace agreement is expressed by OE *frið* in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1055 and by OE *grið* in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1052 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2; the two annals belong to the so-called *Abingdon Chronicle* (see below, II.163.8). However, we also find some differences between the later annals and the *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut*:

- (1) There is an increasing tendency for OE *grið* rather than OE *frið* to refer to peace agreements and truces. This is particularly noticeable in the annals for the years 1070–1121 in the E-version of the *Chronicle* (on which see below, II.163.21). This tendency is in keeping with the fact that in late Old English texts the OE *grið* word-field seems to be in the process of taking over some of the meanings which before either had been shared by the OE *frið* and *grið* word-fields or had solely been expressed by the OE *frið* word-field (cp. the *MED*: s.vv. *grith* and *grithien*). For instance, in connection with the lexico-semantic field under consideration in this section, the tendency should be associated with the replacement of OE *niman frið* in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1009 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1009 = ChronE (Irvine) 1009 with OE *griðian* in ChronF (Baker) 1009 (on the F-version, see below, II.163.22). As far as the lexico-semantic field of protection is concerned (see above, 3.4.2.2.D), the tendency under discussion can be associated with the use of OE *griðian* in AldV 1 (Goossens) 2424 with the meaning ‘to rescue, snatch from danger’, a meaning which until then had been expressed by OE *gefriðian* (see Fell 1982–85: 90–91).
- (2) Later annals of the *Chronicle*, like the Wulfstanian corpus, use the OE *grið* word-field not only in connection with the lexico-semantic field under consideration in this section, but also in connection with the lexico-semantic field of protection (see above, 3.4.2.2.D).

This tendency towards the dominance of the OE *grið* word-field came to an end during the Middle English period, when both the native and the Norse-derived word-fields were left aside in favour of the French-derived ME *pēs* and *prôteccioun* word-fields (see the *MED*: s.vv. *pēs* and *prôteccioun*).

The second and final type of military agreement under consideration in this section refers to an agreement of contract of (military) service, and the wages paid for such contract. The *TOE* (15.02.04) records OE *bigleofa*, *bigwist*, *ear-*

*nung*, *efgeagung*, *egnwirht*, *feoh*, *feohsceatt*, *gyld*, *hȳr*, *lēan*, *mēdsceatt*, and *scipe* as the Old English terms meaning ‘wages’. It does not include OE *māl*, which has the meaning ‘contract of service; covenanted wages’ in three annals of the so-called *Abingdon Chronicle*, viz. ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1049, 1050, and 1055. Of all the terms presented by the *TOE*, the only one used in the *Abingdon Chronicle* is OE *gyld*, which appears in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1049 in the same context as OE *māl*: ‘on þyson ylcan geare Eadwerd cing scy-lode .ix. scypa of male, & hi foron mid scypon mid eallon anweg & belifon .v. scypa bæftan, & se cing heom behet .xii. monað gyld’ (‘in this same year King Edward ended the contract of nine ships and they went away with ships and everything, and five ships were left behind and the king promised them twelve months’ pay’). In this context the chronicler clearly distinguishes between the contract of service and the payment for such service, and this specific reference to the contract rather than the payment is also found in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1050.

ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1049 and 1050 differ in the expression recording OE *māl*: OE *scylian of mǣle* and *settan of mǣle* (on which see below, III.4.LLL), respectively.<sup>48</sup> That OE *scylian of mǣle* may not have been widely used is suggested not only by its absence from ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1050, but also by the fact that ChronE (Irvine) 1047, which refers to the dismissal mentioned in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1049, has instead an expression more similar to that in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1050, viz. OE *settan ūt*, itself fairly uncommon.<sup>49</sup>

The only context where OE *māl* refers specifically to ‘wages’ is ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1055, and it is therefore only in this context that the term is equivalent to OE *gyld*. Interestingly, this meaning for OE *gyld* does not seem to have been particularly common; the term is more commonly recorded in connection with armies when referring to the tribute paid to the Scandinavian raiding army (cp. OE *denegyld* and *heregyld*; see the *DOE*: s.v. *gyld*). Thus, it may be the case — and this obviously has to remain purely speculative — that the chronicler selected OE *gyld* in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1049 because

<sup>48</sup> In ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1018 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1018 = ChronE (Irvine) 1018) we are told that some of the ships serving under Cnut went back to Denmark; Cnut may have said that he wanted *scylian* them *of mǣle*, but the short account in the *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut* does not allow us to have an insight into the terminology used.

<sup>49</sup> We would have expected to find instead a prepositional phrase with OE *of* indicating what or where they were dismissed from; cp. ‘hi woldon þone cyng gesettan ut of Englelandes cynedome’ (‘they wanted to put the king out of the kingdom of England’) in ChronE (Irvine) 1075.8–9.

the payment referred to was associated with an army at least partially made up by Scandinavian mercenaries (see below, 3.4.2.3.A), with whom members of the OE *gyld* word-field are linked on a significant number of occasions (cp. ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1040 and 1041).

The fact that the fleet whose service is referred to in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1049 and 1050 are *liðsmenn* may suggest that OE *māl* with the meaning under consideration here retained some association with the Scandinavian newcomers and their practices during most of the Old English period (see further below, 3.4.2.3.A). From that perspective, it is interesting to note that the Middle English reflex of the term with the similar meanings 'payment, tribute, rent' is recorded mainly in texts associated with the East Midlands and the North (see the *MED*: s.v. *mōl*, n.2, sense a). However, we should also bear in mind the problematic nature of the fleet whose payment is referred to in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1055. Although the *Chronicle* does not give us any information about it other than the fact that it was gathered by Earl Ælfgar while he was in exile in Ireland, Maund (Maund 1991: 165) and Baxter (Baxter 2007a: 46) raise the possibility that it may have been formed by Norwegian mercenaries, for, as Maund (Maund 1991: 165) notes, the Irish annals make several references to the 'vikings of Diarmait [mac Maíl na mBó, king of Leinster]' as a force operating in contemporary Ireland. It could indeed be the case that Ælfgar was helped by Norwegian mercenaries, especially if we consider that during the second period of exile Earl Ælfgar is also said to have been supported by Norwegian troops (see Baxter 2007a: 47), but, given the lack of further information, we cannot be certain, and, therefore, the exclusive association of the Norse-derived term meaning 'contract of service; covenanted wages' with the Scandinavians remains unclear.

(E.3) CONFIRMING AN AGREEMENT: TO CONFIRM, AFFIRM (OE *gēatan*), DRINK CONFIRMING SALE (?) (OE *drincelēan*) AND PAYMENT MADE BY A TENANT TO A LANDOWNER ON ENTERING INTO A HOLDING (OE *gersum(a)*)

The *Peterborough Chronicle* is the only Old English text that records the Norse-derived OE *gēatan*, which has two different meanings, viz. 'to confirm, affirm, agree to (sth.)', discussed in this section, and 'to grant, confer, bestow upon (sb. / sth.)', on which see below, 3.4.2.12.A. All the attestations of the first meaning are recorded in interpolated charters, and, on one occasion, it is presented as a (near)synonym of OE *fulfestnian* (viz. ChronE (Irvine) 675.44). While the native verb is not attested again in the *OEC*, the simplex OE *festnian* seems to have been the core member of the lexico-semantic field in Old English, for it is widely attested in law codes (e.g. LawIAs 0.2 and 8.5,

and LawVIatr 1), charters (e.g. Ch 1032 (Rob 120) 36, on which see below, II.15.1.1), the *Chronicle* annals (e.g. ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1055.24), and the Peterborough Interpolations (e.g. ChronE (Irvine) 675.56 and ChronE (Irvine) 963.20 and 45).<sup>50</sup> Interestingly, though, this verb is slightly less common in the Interpolations and the First Continuation than the Norse-derived verb, which might (although not necessarily so) be indicative of a slightly different structure of the lexico-semantic field in the chronicler's / chroniclers' idiolect(s) or dialect. In any case, the main difference between these two verbs seems to have been the dialectally marked character of the Norse-derived term (at least during the Old English period; see above, 2.4.2.K).

Two Norse-derived terms, viz. OE *drincelēan* and *gæsum(a)*, refer to different ways in which agreements were confirmed. As pointed out above, 2.5.G, the meaning of OE *drincelēan* is not clear. Various translations, such as 'reward for drink', 'entertainment given by a lord to his tenants', and 'drink confirming sale', have been suggested. Regardless of whichever translation we consider to be most appropriate, they indicate that the term is likely to have allowed for a more precise expression, as no native term has any of the aforementioned meanings. While the term might have started as dialectally marked (cp. OE *gæsum(a)*; see below), the extant texts do not allow us to see any trace of that association (see above, 3.3.4, and below, I.23); however, despite its presence in a legal text which was sent around the country (see above, 3.4.2.2.C.1) and the possibility of semantic specialization it offered, it seems to have been a fairly uncommon term, its attestation in *II Cnut* being its only record in English texts.

OE *gæsum(a)* is generally recorded with the non-technical meaning 'precious object, treasure' (see below, 3.4.2.12.B.1), but in two contexts its meaning seems to be rather different. In Ch 1476 (Rob 114) it refers to a payment which a tenant had to give to the landowner when entering into a holding, a technical meaning without precedent as far as the term's etymon is concerned which is well attested in Middle English texts, mainly from the areas settled by the Scandinavian newcomers (see the *MED*: s.v. *gersume*, sense 2, and the *DOE*: s.v. *gæsum*, *gæsuma*, *gæsume*, sense 2; cp. the *EDD*: s.v. *grassum*, and Thorson 1936: 27). The *TOE* (15.02.04.01) lists OE *gafol*, *gafolræden*, *sceatt*, and *toll* as terms meaning 'rent'; however, OE *gafolræden* and *toll* could be left out of the discussion on the (near)synonyms of the Norse-derived term because the former is not recorded in charters (see the *DOE*: s.v. *gafolræden*), and the latter

<sup>50</sup> The *TOE* also records OE (*ge*)*cȳðan* as meaning 'to confirm, ratify' (*TOE*: 14.04.03), but this verb is not as commonly attested as OE *festnian*, nor is OE *trymman* / *trymian*, which is sometimes recorded together with OE *festnian* (e.g. Ch 1032 (Rob 120) 35–36).

does not seem to have referred to the type of payment under consideration (see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *toll*). OE *gafol* and *sceatt* are commonly used in charters to indicate payments which are owed to a landowner (see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *sceatt*, sense Ia, Toller 1921: s.v. *sceatt*, and the *DOE*: s.v. *gafoll*, sense 3). However, they do not specifically refer to the payment due when entering the holding, and indeed, the Middle English sources agree with the impression given by Ch 1476 (Rob 114) that the payment referred to by OE *gersum(a)* was not something recurrent, but rather an amount paid on a special occasion. From this perspective, the term may have allowed for a higher degree of semantic specialization than the native nouns, and this may have contributed to its survival in this specialized sense.

The attestation of the Norse-derived term in Rec 15 (Birch 106) is somewhat more problematic because it renders L *munus* ‘duty, function, type, office’; it may be the case that, as suggested by the *DOE* (s.v. *gersum*, *gersuma*, *gersume*, sense 3), the Latin term was interpreted as meaning instead ‘payment, gift, remuneration’, which would associate this usage with that in Ch 1476 (Rob 114). Whatever the reason for the use of the Norse-derived term in this context, it is notable that neither text seems to originate from the Scandinavianized areas, where, as noted above, the term with the technical meaning under discussion here became particularly common.

#### (E.4) CONSEQUENCE OF MAKING AN AGREEMENT: BEING AGREED, CONCORDANT (OE *sammāle*)

The *TOE* suggests the OE *sammāle* overlaps with OE *gemōd*, *gemōdsum*, and *unwiderweardlic*, none of which is particularly common (*TOE*: 09.07.04.01); indeed, none of them is attested in the texts recording OE *sammāle*. The extant records suggest that, while the Norse-derived term enjoyed some popularity around the turn of the eleventh century, this popularity was relatively brief. Notably, the later annals of the *Chronicle* frequently use OE *seht* as a synonym of OE *sammāle* (e.g. ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1052, ChronE (Irvine) 1096) and OE *unseht* as its antonym (e.g. ChronD (Cubbin) 1067 and ChronE (Irvine) 1102). No Middle English reflex of the term is recorded in the *MED*.

The adjective differs from other members of the OE *māl* word-field in both its significant number of attestations (see below, I.58.5) and, as far as some of the members of the field are concerned, its lack of specific association with the Scandinavianized areas (see above, 3.3.3–4). In fact, it is interesting to note that there is a clear difference between the members of the field in their association with the Scandinavian newcomers and their practices (see the various subdivisions of 3.4.2.2.E). The only attestations of OE *frīðmāl* and the

expression OE *mund* and *māldæg* are recorded in texts connected with the Scandinavians, while OE *formæl* / *formāl(a)* is only recorded once in a text clearly associated with the Scandinavian newcomers. In complete contrast with this, the simplex OE *māl*, the compound OE *sammæle*, and the expression OE *cuman tō wiðermāle* are not initially recorded with a unique association with the Scandinavian newcomers, although some of the contexts where the simplex and OE *sammæle* are recorded do bear some connection with them (see above, 3.3.3). Notably, though, with the exception of OE *sammæle*, the first members of the word-field to be recorded are the ones which show a clearer association with the Scandinavian newcomers and the areas where they settled (see below, I.58). The Old English records may, therefore, show us a word-field in its process of adaptation. Such clear differences between the members of this word-field could be associated with the fact that the complexes forming part of the OE *māl* word-field seem to have been borrowed as ready-made terms (see above, 2.2.1.7.A) and may, therefore, have functioned almost as fully independent terms. In this respect this word-field differs from the OE *lagu* word-field (and, possibly, the OE *grið* word-field), because in the case of the OE *lagu* word-field, once the simplex had ceased to refer to the Scandinavian newcomers, new complexes, without any specific dialectal or ethnographic associations, were created (see above, 3.4.2.2.C.3 and 3.4.2.2.D).

### 3.4.2.3. Martial activities

(A) A FLEET AND ITS CREW (OE *lið* word-field, *hāsæta*, and *būtsecarl*)

It is not surprising that some of the earliest Norse-derived terms attested in Old English texts not associated with the Scandinavianized areas refer to the military lexico-semantic field. After all, fighting was one of the first activities the Scandinavian marauders and the Anglo-Saxons engaged in; thus, Old English speakers probably had more opportunities than they wished for to encounter terms belonging to this field. Again unsurprisingly, the first term to be recorded (viz. OE *sumorlida*; Group 1, see above, 3.3.1) refers to the attacker's army. It is, however, not until more than a century later that we find another Norse-derived term referring to an army and its members, viz. OE *liðsmann* (Group 4: ChronE (Irvine) 1036; see above, 3.3.4). The *liðsmenn* were a military body significant enough to be represented at a meeting in Oxford during the succession dispute following Cnut's death, which suggests that they were in service during Cnut's reign. Even though it is not clear that it was Cnut himself who instituted this military body,<sup>51</sup> which may initially have been formed mainly by

<sup>51</sup> ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1012 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1012 = ChronE (Irvine) 1012 =



Scandinavians, the use of the term itself may have originated from Cnut's court (cp. OE *hūscarl*; see below, 3.4.2.6.A.4), where, as suggested by the existence of Scandinavian courtiers, Old Norse had most likely a significant presence (see Frank 1994 and Townend 2001: 164–72).<sup>52</sup> Interestingly, the terms of service of this military body are expressed in Norse-derived terminology:

- (1) ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1049 and 1050 record the structures OE *scylīan* / *settan of mǣle* 'to discharge from service' (on which see above, 3.4.2.2.E.2) in connection with the group of people.<sup>53</sup>
- (2) In ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1040 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1040; cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1039) we are told about their payment.<sup>54</sup> The money is counted in marks, a usage which is in keeping with the fact that during Cnut's reign the mark became the normal unit of weight for both gold and silver (see below, 3.4.2.4.A). More importantly, we are told that eight marks are paid 'æt hamelan' ('by rowlock'). ChronE (Irvine) 1039 tells us that the amount paid 'æt hamelan' followed the practice during Cnut's reign; the terminology to refer to it may have been adopted together with the practice.

Indeed, it was important to be told by the court about payments to the Scandinavian troops and their dismissal because such issues would have had a significant impact on taxation (see Hollister 1962: ch. 1). Needless to say though, the suggestion that this specialized terminology may have originated from Cnut's court, which may explain its presence in annals not clearly associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see below, II.163.8), is purely speculative. In any case, the clustering of these Norse-derived terms remains interesting and highly intriguing.

Thus, at least at the beginning, the main difference between the OE *lið* word-field and others belonging to the lexico-semantic field under considera-

ChronF (Baker) 1012 records that Æthelred took into his service forty-five Scandinavian ships (see Hooper 1992a: 10, Hooper 1994: 97–99, and Lawson 1993: 117).

<sup>52</sup> See Pons-Sanz 2007b: 234–35, and below, 3.4.2.11.A.1 and I.54.7.3.E, for other cases where the use of Norse-derived terms in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* may be associated with reports from the Cnutian court.

<sup>53</sup> It is thanks to ChronE (Irvine) 1047 that we know that the ships dismissed in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1049 are associated with the *liðsmenn*.

<sup>54</sup> Admittedly, the annals do not specifically mention the *liðsmenn*; however, it can be assumed that they are the ones manning the ships (cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1047; see above, note 53 in this chapter). On the wages mentioned in the *Chronicle* and how they compare with those of (near)contemporary warriors, see Hollister 1962: 106–07.



tion (for which see the *TOE*: 13.02.10.03) is likely to have been the cultural association of the word-field. Yet, despite the likely initial association of OE *liðsmann* with people mainly of Scandinavian origin, it seems that the term and its word-field soon became integrated into Old English. OE *liðsmann* would have been easily analysable as ‘a man associated with or belonging to a *lið*’. That the use of OE *lið* may be the result of back-formation is suggested by the fact that it is attested later than the compound (Group 6). The simplex soon became productive itself; cp. the compound OE *sciplið*, also attested as part of the *Abingdon Chronicle* (Group 6).<sup>55</sup> The first attestations of the simplex may be found in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1052 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2, where the term refers to a royal fleet of forty small vessels which King Edward gathered at Sandwich to fight against Earl Godwin, and to the fleet which the Earl gathered around Sandwich by enticing the *būtsecarlas* he encountered on the way (see below); the term is used in that entry in contrast to OE *landfyrd* ‘land-army’. Hooper (Hooper 1992b: 22) suggests that the ships involved on King Edward’s side must have been the national ship-levy and, therefore, we can no longer see an exclusive connection between the word-field and the Scandinavian troops. In that respect, the word-field can be said to be very close from a semantic and cultural perspective to OE *here*, which is initially used in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as a term for invading forces, particularly of a Scandinavian origin, but which later on seems to have lost its exclusive association with the Scandinavian newcomers (see above, note 21 in this chapter). The main difference between OE *lið* and OE *here* may be that the former seems to refer specifically to the nautical side of an army, i.e. a fleet, whereas the latter does not have such a narrow meaning (but see note 55 in this chapter).

Notably, though, the change in the ethnic associations of the word-field may be linked to dialectal differences, although as in many other cases, caution has to be exercised due to our restricted sources. The late eleventh-century northern annals shared by the D- and E-versions (here referred to as ChronNor2; see below, II.163.17) maintain the association of OE *lið* with the Scandinavian marauders, as all its uses refer to fleets coming from Denmark (see below, I.55.1). In contrast, the annals of the so-called *Abingdon Chronicle*, which, wherever they may actually originate from, are likely to have been composed in an area less heavily Scandinavianized than that of the previous annals, do not exhibit a similarly ethnically restricted use. Whatever the origin of the war-

<sup>55</sup> This compound could be interpreted as tautological or it may be an indication that OE *lið* could mean, at least in some varieties, ‘troop’ more generally rather than merely ‘fleet’ (cp. ME *liþ*; see the *MED*: s.v. *liþ*, n.3).

riors manning the eighteen ships gathered by Earl Ælfgar in Ireland in 1055 (referred to with OE *lið* and *sciplið* in ChronC (Cubbin) 1055; see above, 3.4.2.2.E.2),<sup>56</sup> as pointed out above, there does not seem to be any connection between the Scandinavians and the *lið* gathered by King Edward in 1052,<sup>57</sup> nor are the *būtsecarlas* manning Godwine's fleet likely to be of Scandinavian origin (see below in this section).

The so-called *Abingdon Chronicle* accounts for most of the occurrences of OE *lið* and the only occurrence of OE *sciplið*. Needless to say, we cannot be certain about the authorship of the annals where the terms are recorded (see below, II.163.8) and, hence, speculations about personal linguistic varieties or idiolects are impossible. All we can say is that OE *lið* entered the list of acceptable words to be used in the annals when talking about a fleet of mercenaries and, after becoming fully integrated into the Old English lexicon, became productive (but see above, 2.2.2.3.B). The word-field does not seem to have enjoyed much popularity outside the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, though, for its members are only recorded in the annals, and of all the members of the word-field, the *MED* only records a reflex of the simplex, which is only attested two or three times in Middle English texts (see the *MED*: s.v. *lith*, n.3, and Dance 2003: 398).

As noted above, OE *lið* in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2 is associated with the national ship-levy on the one hand, and with the fleet gathered by Earl Godwine by enticing people along the south-eastern coast on the other. ChronE (Irvine) 1052 refers to those manning Edward's fleet as *hāsætan*, while in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2 we are told that those joining forces with Godwine were *būtsecarlas*. This seems to suggest that in these contexts the seemingly nautical terms are being used as military terms (i.e. as (near)synonyms of OE *liðsmenn*), and that is the reason for their inclusion in this section rather than in 3.4.2.5 (see below). The hapax legomenon OE *hāsæta* 'rower', seems to have been a very peripheral member of its lexico-semantic field; the use of OE *reðra* 'rower' (either by itself or as the determinatum in the compound OE *scipreðra*; see e.g. PrudGl 1 (Meritt) 82) is more common in Old English texts. The popularity of OE *būtsecarl* 'boatman', on the other hand, appears to have increased

<sup>56</sup> ChronD (Cubbin) 1055, which, according to Baxter (Baxter 2007b: 1223–24), is likely to derive from the same source as the C-annal, calls this fleet OE *geŋe* (on this term, see below, III.4.AA).

<sup>57</sup> The latter is likely to refer instead to the national ship-levy, which is otherwise referred to as OE *scipfyrð* (see ChronD (Cubbin) 1072 = ChronE (Irvine) 1072).

significantly at the end of the Old English period,<sup>58</sup> and it seems to have been still in use in the early Middle English period: we find it as a by-name in English texts (see the *MED*: s.v. *būte-carl*), and John of Worcester includes it in his *Chronicle* not only in the entries for 1052 and 1066, which follow the wording in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, but also in the entry for 1101, which refers to the defence forces raised by the king in Southern England to get ready for a possible invasion by Duke Robert of Normandy (see Darlington and others 1995–98: II, 568 and 600, and II, 96 and 98).<sup>59</sup>

The nature of the group referred to as *būtsecarlas* has been greatly debated by Anglo-Saxon historians. Some of them (e.g. Hollister 1962: 18, Lawson 1993: 179, and Abels 2008: 160) believe that they were mercenaries, professional sailor-warriors for hire; others, though, led by Hooper, suggest that they are likely to have been ‘the inhabitants of the maritime towns of Kent and Sussex, some of whom owed naval service to the king and whose obligations would later lead to the Cinque Ports organisation’ (Hooper 1992b: 21).<sup>60</sup> OE *būtsecarl* could then be seen as the new term to replace the seemingly ethnically charged and organizationally obsolete OE *liðsmann* (cp. Lawson 1993: 179). As noted by Hooper, OE *būtsecarl* reflects that, rather than heavily relying on mercenaries, ‘by the time of Edward the Confessor the crown was taking advantage of the ships of its subjects for naval service’ (Hooper 1992b: 21).<sup>61</sup> Such reliance, though, is not likely to have started during the Confessor’s reign, for LawVAtr 26.1, LawVIAtr 32.3, and LawIICn 10 already refer to land and sea military obligations (OE *fyrðung* and *scipfyrðung*).

Besides the semantic relationship between the terms discussed in this section, it might be important to highlight the concentration of Norse-derived terms in connection with fleets operating from Sandwich and London (cp. OE *healdan*; see below, 3.4.2.5.D). Whether this is coincidental or in some way reflects the local nautical technoelect is, of course, very difficult to tell, although

<sup>58</sup> The term is also recorded in an entry for Malmesbury, Wiltshire, in Domesday Book; see WIL B.5.

<sup>59</sup> We should not forget either that the term was borrowed into Anglo-Norman as *bucekarle* (see Sayers 2003: 303–09).

<sup>60</sup> On the Cinque Ports organization, see further Hollister 1962: 115–23, and Tatton-Brown 1984: 2.

<sup>61</sup> Cp. Gardiner 1999: 86–87, who suggests that these are likely to have been merchant ships. Hooper hypothesizes that those referred to in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1066 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1066 as attempting to raise Edgar the Ætheling to the throne may have been ‘part of the fleet Harold is reputed to have sent to blockade Hastings after the Norman landing and which did not return to their ports because of William’s harrying’ (Hooper 1992b: 21).

we should remember that Hooper (Hooper 1992b: 20) mentions that the *liðs-menn* are likely to have been based in London and that they probably operated in Sandwich, one of the main ports in Anglo-Saxon England (see Tatton-Brown 1984: 19).

**(B) WARRIOR (OE *dreng*)**

The extant records might suggest that OE *dreng* as a military term was fairly uncommon. The meaning of its only attestation in Old English texts (viz. Mald 149) is not clear at all. The *DOE* (s.v. *dreng*, sense 1) suggests that the term here may mean ‘lad, warrior’. It may be that the poet was aware of the fact that the Scandinavian newcomers often used the term to refer to each other and, perhaps with some misunderstanding about its exact meaning, used it as a culturally specific term in association with the Scandinavian warriors (cp. Jesch 2001b: 217). Jesch summarizes the use of the Norse etymon in skaldic and runic texts as follows:

*drengr* belongs to the vocabulary of the in-group [...]. The collocations suggest that the context could include bands of warriors, bands of merchants, and any other close-knit group of men. Because such bands were most likely to have been composed of relatively young men establishing themselves, the word also came to acquire a connotation of youth (though not invariably). (Jesch 2001b: 229)

It could also be the case, though, that OE *dreng* was well integrated in the dialect or idiolect of the *Maldon*-poet as just another term meaning ‘warrior’, for this meaning is well attested in Middle English texts, particularly in *Lazamon’s Brut* and the *Cursor Mundi*, i.e. in texts from different dialectal areas (see the *MED*: s.v. *dreng*, sense 1.a, Pons-Sanz 2008: 441, and below, 4.2.4). It would be a handy alternative to other generic Old English nouns with a similar meaning: this noun, which appears in alliterative position in the text, is the only word meaning ‘man, warrior’ starting with /d/ mentioned by the *TOE* (13.02.10.01) besides OE *dædfruma*; given that the determinatum of the latter means, amongst other things, ‘chief, ruler, prince’ (see the *DOE*: s.v. *fruma*, sense 3), it has connotations of leadership and, therefore, it would not be a good option for the *Maldon*-passage (see the *DOE*: s.v. *dæd-fruma*).

Yet another alternative is that the Norse-derived term could be understood in its (English) social sense, i.e. as a reference to a freeman of low social status (cp. Mald 132, where a Viking is called *ceorl* ‘freeman of the lowest class, peasant’; see below, 3.4.2.6.A.3; cp. Scragg 1981: 77). This would bring the *Maldon*-usage close to the meaning which the Norse-derived noun seems to have in some late Northumbrian material, i.e. ‘member of a class of free ten-

ants holding land by a form of tenure the nature of which was partly military and partly servile' (*DOE*: s.v. *dreng*, sense 1a; see further above, 2.4.2.E, below, IV.2.3.2.C, and Cormack 2000: 64–67). This meaning seems to be the outcome of a process of semantic specialization undergone by the term on English soil.<sup>62</sup> The social status of the Northumbrian drengs is not very clear, though. Roffe suggests, on the basis of Domesday Book material, that in some areas there may not have been much difference between the lower thegns and drengs: 'the Yorkshire thane paid the same relief as the Lancashire dreng who was also known indifferently as a thane' (Roffe 1990: 330; cp. Barrow 1969: 10–11).<sup>63</sup>

Thus, in a nutshell, although a military interpretation of the term in *The Battle of Maldon* seems likely, it is not possible to be certain about the exact meaning of the term in its only attestation in Old English.

#### (C) EQUIPMENT USED FOR FIGHTING: SMALL AXE (OE *taperex*)

Although Norse-derived terms referring to troops are recorded already in Group 1 texts not associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see above, 3.4.2.3.A), the attestation of terms referring to the equipment used for fighting took longer: OE *brynige* is first recorded in Group 4 texts and all its attestations belong to Old English texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see above, 3.3.4),<sup>64</sup> while OE *taperex* is only recorded in three closely related eleventh-century contexts (viz. Ch 959 (Rob 82) = ChronA (Bately) 1031 = ChronF (Baker) 1029; see below, I.87).

<sup>62</sup> There is much debate amongst Old Norse scholars about the meaning of the Viking-Age Norse etymon of OE *dreng*. Some scholars, particularly historians, have argued that the Norse term could act as a title indicating social status within the class of freemen, mainly on the basis of service to a particular king (see, for instance, Aakjær 1927–28; cp. Christophersen 1981–82 and Cormack 2000: 62); others, led by philologists, downplay the social interpretation of this term on the basis of lack of contemporary evidence in that respect (see, for instance, Syrett 2000 and Jesch 2001b: 216–32).

<sup>63</sup> On the later worsening of their social status, see Maitland 1890, Lapsley 1904, and Jolliffe 1926.

<sup>64</sup> However, the record of OE *healsbrynige* in AldV 10 (Nap) (on which, see below, II.4.3) may hint towards a more widespread use of the term in late Old English. This suggestion may also be supported by the attestations of ME *brinie* in early Middle English texts from the South-West and South-East Midlands (see the *MED*: s.v. *brinie*, and Dance 2003: 344), as well as in one of the so-called *Vespasian Homilies*, which have southern morphology and Kentish phonology and which may originate from Rochester (see M. Richards 1978, and note 7 in Appendix IV). On the reasons why the OE *brynige* word-field is not discussed in any detail in this section, see above, 3.4.1.

The limited attestation of OE *taperex* and the fact that it is not recorded in Middle English texts suggest that it must have been a very marginal member of its lexico-semantic field, and of the OE *æx* word-field. Old English speakers must have found it very useful to be able to specify the type of axe under consideration, for we encounter OE *æx* 'axe' as the determinatum of various compounds: OE *brādæx* 'broad ax', *brādlāstæx* '? an axe which has a broad head, ? an axe which leaves a broad track', *ceorfæx* 'hewing axe, cutting axe' (DOE: s.vv. *brādæx*, *brādlāstæx*, *ceorfæx*), *handæx* 'an axe to be wielded by one hand' (OED 1989: s.v. *hand-axe*), *stānæx* 'a stone æx, ? an implement for working stone' (Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *stān-æx*), etc. Thus, the Norse-derived OE *taperex* became part of an already fairly extensive word-field and allowed for further precision. However, unlike the other determinants, OE *taper-* would not have been easily recognizable by the Anglo-Saxons; they would have soon realized that it could not be associated with the more common term OE *tapor*, *taper* 'wax candle'. The existence of this homophone, which made it difficult for OE *taperex* to share with the other compounds of the word-field the possibility of being interpreted as 'type familiar', may have contributed to the disappearance of the compound.<sup>65</sup>

### 3.4.2.4. Monetary terms

#### (A) UNITS OF WEIGHT AND ACCOUNT (OE *marc* word-field and *ȝre* / *ōra*)

Tracing the use of the two Norse-derived monetary units of weight and account, viz. OE *marc* and *ȝre* / *ōra*, in Old English texts involves investigating the process by which two dialectally marked and peripheral members of the lexico-semantic field became core monetary terms in late Anglo-Scandinavian and early Anglo-Norman England. Nightingale's seminal articles (Nightingale 1983, Nightingale 1984, and Nightingale 1985) are fundamental to undertake that task. The reader will find in her work a detailed account of the changing values of these units during the period under consideration. The focus here will be on the semantic and dialectal relationship between the terms and other members of the lexico-semantic field.

<sup>65</sup> Meys distinguishes between *type familiarity* and *item familiarity* in these terms: 'item familiarity [...] implies direct knowledge of particular phonological forms plus direct knowledge of any underlying structure — regular and/or idiosyncratic — associated with that particular phonological form. [...] [P]roductive compound-forming patterns, [...] which map abstract syntactic configurations onto other "condensed" abstract configurations, are type-familiar. They are abstract pre-generated paths by means of which novel regular compounds can be formed' (Meys 1975: 61). On the impact of homonymy on borrowing, see, however, note 22 in Chapter 2.



Until the end of the tenth century, the use of OE *marc* and *ȝre / ōra*, was restricted to the Scandinavianized areas (see above, 3.3.2–3).<sup>66</sup> Even there, though, they do not seem to have been the core members of their lexico-semantic field: Nightingale (Nightingale 1984: 235–36) explains that the evidence originating from wills and charters suggests that even in the Danelaw by the late tenth century the twelve-penny shilling (OE *scilling*) rather than the sixteen-penny ora was the most common unit of account.<sup>67</sup> The ora was more commonly used as a weight unit; for instance, we encounter it in references to purchases of land with bullion (e.g. Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) 76). Similarly, Nightingale notes, although the half-mark (OE *healfmarc*) appears in the legal codes aimed at the Danelaw (e.g. LawIIIATR 1.2, 3.2, 12, 13.2, 13.4), it seems to be a traditional fine, rather than the common weight or unit of account. The reason for this, as hypothesized by Nightingale, may have been that, given that King Edgar had established that there should be one coinage and one standard of weight throughout the kingdom (see LawIII Eg 8–8.1), it was difficult to sustain the use of the eight-ora (= eight-ounce) mark because it could not be easily used with the fifteen-ounce Mercian pound (OE *pund*).

We first encounter the Norse-derived terms in a document which is not restricted to the Danelaw as part of Æthelred's legislation on coinage (LawIVATR 9.2; see Liebermann 1903–16: I, 236, and Wormald 1999: 322), where we are told that fifteen oras equal one pound. Nightingale (Nightingale 1984: 234–35) hypothesizes that the reason for the use of OE *ōra* in this code may have been an attempt to avoid confusion with the different weight units used by the West-Saxons: Æthelred's pound of fifteen oras may descend from the Mercian pound of fifteen ounces, whereas the West-Saxon pound comprised twelve ounces. While this usage could be interpreted as an isolated case, it shows that the term is likely to have been well enough known for it to be included in a text with a wide audience. It is, in any case, only when we look at the texts belonging to Group 4 that we see a more frequent and well-established use of the Norse-derived terminology outside areas / texts with Scandinavian influence.

When Cnut conquered England, he replaced Æthelred's fifteen-ora / ounce pound with one of ten ounces and changed the standard weight of the ounce from 24.5g to 27g, the standard weight of the Roman ounce, which was still used for gold coinage in Byzantium (Nightingale 1985: 197). He took this

<sup>66</sup> See below, 4.2.3, on possible dialectal differences in familiarity with this term during the late tenth century.

<sup>67</sup> On the use in late Anglo-Saxon and early Anglo-Norman England of the twenty-penny ora, see Nightingale 1983.



attempt to make English standards align with international standards one step further by tackling the weight units of gold. The weight system for gold had previously differed from the system used for silver; it depended in the main on the *mancus* (OE *mancus*; possibly, 4.5g) and the pound. Cnut dropped the *mancus* as the standard weight unit of gold and adopted the mark as the standard measure for both silver (e.g. Ch 1465 (Rob 86) 17) and gold (e.g. Ch 1473 (Rob 103) 3). By doing that, he was trying to promote international trade as well as protect the interests of the Scandinavians, who before the mid-eleventh century exchanged coins only by weight, using *oras* and marks, and not by face value (remember the use of OE *marc* in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1040 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1040 = ChronE (Irvine) 1039 in connection with the payment of *liðsmenn*; see above, 3.4.2.3.A). Thus, the last reference to the *mancus* as a weight unit for gold in Old English texts appears in LawIICn 71a and 71.1 (early 1020s).<sup>68</sup> The Cnutian reforms, then, had a significant impact on the lexico-semantic field and, indeed, from then onwards OE *marc* and *ȝre / ðra* appear in texts which are no longer restricted to the Scandinavianized areas (see above, 3.3.4 and 3.3.6).

### 3.4.2.5. Navigation

(A) SHIP TYPES: SMALL BOAT (OE *flēge*), SHIP FOR AN INVADING ARMY (OE *cnearr* word-field and *scegd*), SHIP WITH BEAKED PROW (OE *barð(a)*)

The advanced technology used by the Scandinavians to build their ships had a significant impact in Western Europe, as reflected by the Norse-derived loans belonging to this semantic field in various European languages (see the articles edited by Ridel 2002).<sup>69</sup> The lightness and high manoeuvrability of the Scandinavian ships, which made them particularly suitable for hit-and-run attacks, is likely to have been an issue of concern and, to a certain extent, envy for the Anglo-Saxons (see Swanton 1999). It is, therefore, not surprising that we encounter terms for various types of ships amongst the earliest

<sup>68</sup> Cnut also managed to bring the English and Danish reckoning systems in line by reducing the weight of the penny: instead of a sixteen-penny *ora*, he introduced a twenty-four-penny *ora*. This division suited the duodecimal system of reckoning favoured by the Scandinavians (cp. OE *hundred* = 120; see above, 2.4.2.N), as well as the English shilling, which, as noted above, was equivalent to twelve pence (Nightingale 1984: 241).

<sup>69</sup> We should not forget, though, that the Scandinavians also seem to have learnt from the cultures they came into contact with, as suggested again by some loans (e.g. OIc *bátr* < OE *bāt* and OIc *keipull*, a Celtic loan-word, cp. Breton *caubal* and Old Welsh \**caupol*; see further Thier 2009).

Norse-derived loans in English. The first attestations (viz. OE *flēge*, *cnearr*, and *nægledcnearr*) could be said to be associated with the Scandinavians, either directly (but see above, 2.4.1.A) or from a dialectal perspective. However, once in English, these technical terms are likely to have circulated quite freely even amongst those Anglo-Saxons who did not have much contact with the Scandinavian newcomers. Thus, OE *barð* and *barða* only reflect the end of the process of integration of the terms into Old English because their attestations have no connection at all with the Scandinavian newcomers (see above, 3.3.4), while the attestations of the OE *scegð* word-field allow us to see the development of such process (see below).

OE *flēge* is only recorded in the Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and the related glosses to Rushworth 2 (see below, I.31). The term renders L *navicula* ‘small vessel, boat, skiff’; the most common glosses for this lemma in Aldred’s work are, firstly, OE *scip* and, secondly, OE *lytel scip*. Only on two occasions did Aldred choose other terms to render the lemma, although on both occasions the terms are presented as (near)synonyms of OE *lytel scip*: OE *cuopel* (< ML *caupulus* ‘small boat’, or of Celtic origin, cp. OW \**caupol*; see the OED 1989: s.v. *coble*<sup>1</sup>, and Thier 2000a) in MtGl (Li) 8.23 (its only attestation in Old English), and OE *flēge* in JnGl (Li) 6.22. Interestingly, both terms are loan-words and, given their very limited attestations in Old English texts, both of them seem to have been peripheral members of the lexico-semantic field. This may be the reason for their occurrence in a double gloss together with the more common *interpretamentum*. We should note, though, that Owun rendered L *navicula* only with OE *flēge*, which could be taken as a sign that he considered the term to be familiar enough to stand alone.

As noted above, 2.4.1.A, ON *knorr* was borrowed into many European languages, besides Old English: OFr. *kenar*, OIr. *cna(i)rr*, OHG *gnarrun*.<sup>70</sup> In all these languages it seems to refer to a ship which was appropriate to be used by invading armies. The exact type of ship denoted by the Old Norse etymon is not clear, and there has been some debate about whether it referred to a warship or a cargo ship, which is the meaning that the term has in West Norse skaldic texts from the eleventh century (see Jesch 2001b: 128–32). Jesch hypothesizes that in the ninth and most of the tenth century there would not have been much difference between warships and cargo ships in terms of their shape; the differentiation between these purposes would have come in the eleventh century with the broadening of the ship in order to allow it to sail across the ocean and carry heavy cargo (see Jesch 2001b: 132).

<sup>70</sup> Cp. Gaelic *cnarra*; see Gammeltoft 2004: 79.

The Old English occurrences certainly seem to indicate that this was a type of ship appropriate for an invading army, to some extent because of its speed. This is suggested by the fact that it glosses L *nauibus actuariis* (L *navis actuario* 'swift ship') in OccGl 45.1.2 (Meritt) 20 (see above, 2.4.1.A).<sup>71</sup> In this respect, the Old English term may have been a (near)synonym of OE *æsc*, which is also commonly used in connection with the Scandinavian newcomers (see below, III.3.1.A). The difference between the two may lie, among other issues, in their appearance: as noted above, 2.4.1.A, Sayers (Sayers 1996: 283–85) suggests that the likely etymological meaning of ON *knorr*, i.e. 'knobbed, gnarled', should be understood, not from an internal perspective (i.e. referring to the fact that the wood *knerrir* were made of had knots), but rather from an external perspective (i.e. as a reference to a ship whose hull was prominently marked by nail heads). This may be what OE *nægledcnearr* pointed at, but we should bear in mind that, as noted by Thier (Thier 2002: 76), the use of the determinatum is by no means restricted to this type of ship (cp. OE *nægledbord* in Gen 1418 and 1433, where it refers to the ark).

*The Battle of Brunanburh*, though, does not present OE *æsc* as equivalent to the Norse-derived term. Rather, the poetic term OE *lid* 'ship, vessel' is used on two occasions to refer to the ships the Scandinavian invaders travelled in (viz. Brun 27 and 34). The selection of either term is dictated by the needs of alliteration. Given the very general meaning of the native term, it is not clear whether the poet had a particular type of ship in mind when using the Norse-derived term or s/he just selected a ship term that would fit the context. Similarly, whether, as suggested by Carroll (Carroll 2001: 101 n. 84), the poet selected the Norse-derived term as a way of presenting himself/herself as an authoritative voice by using culturally specific diction cannot be easily established (cp. the use of OE *grīð* next to OE *frīð* in the Viking messenger's speech included in *The Battle of Maldon*; see below, 4.2.4).

It is not clear either what ship type was denoted by the Viking Age Norse etymon of OE *scegð*. Jesch (Jesch 2001b: 123) explains that the Norse term commonly appears in skaldic poetry in martial contexts, which seems to indicate that it referred to a warship. Other than that, all we know is that 'they are described as *langar* ['long'], but they need not all be the same length; they can also be slender, armoured, heavily laden and with armed men' (Jesch 2001b: 124).<sup>72</sup> The

<sup>71</sup> Therefore, Niles's suggestion (Niles 1987: 360) that the *Brunanburh*-poet may have intended some comedy in making the king flee in a merchant vessel cannot be easily accepted.

<sup>72</sup> This ambiguity may have been captured in the seemingly contradictory gloss recorded

*scegð* mentioned in the will of Bishop Ælfwold of Crediton (Ch 1492 (Nap-Steven 10)) is said to have sixty-four oars and, therefore, to have been a large ship (see Thier 2002: 33, and Thier 2002: 152); this indeed tallies with the translation for OE *scegð* provided by ChronF (Baker) 1008, viz. ‘unam magnam navem’ (‘one large ship’).

This type of ship was originally associated with the Scandinavians and their activities. If we accept Hart’s dating of Ch 1487 (Whitelock 13) to 989 (Hart 1966: no. 24), this document, which is associated with East Anglia (see below, II.145), would be the first text to record a member of the word-field. The exclusive association of the term (and the word-field more generally; see below, 3.4.2.5.B) soon ended, though, probably as a result of the fact that King Æthelred decided to adopt this type of ship as part of his programme to modernize a fleet which may have consisted of vessels decayed beyond repair (see Hooper 1992b: 22).<sup>73</sup> Thus, from referring to a *\*herescip*, it became a type of ship that could be referred to as a *fyrðscip* (cp. LawVIATR 33 and 34; see also above, note 21 in this chapter and 3.4.2.3.A). It is therefore not surprising to find it in Bishop Ælfwold’s will, which should be associated with Devon (see below, II.148).

The glossary recorded in Antwerp, Plantin-Moretus Museum, MS 47 gives us a relatively full description of the type of ship that OE *barð* would have referred to: ‘rostrata navis quam demonem vocamus aureum rostrum habet’ (‘the ship with a curved prow that we call *dromo* has a splendid beak’) (see AntGl 4 (Kindschi) 1315).<sup>74</sup> The TOE (05.12.01.09.03.01.01) gives OE *hornscip*, *hringedstefna*, *hringnaca*, and *wundenstefna* as (near)synonyms of the Norse-derived term. However, these are all poetic compounds. The glossaries themselves give OE *æsc* ‘light, swift ship’ as equivalent, for it glosses L

in the Plantin-Moretus Glossary, where L *scapha* [vel] *trieris* is glossed as ‘litel scip sceigð’ (cp. Hooper 1992b: 27). However, it may also be the case that OE *lytel scip* renders L *scapha* ‘a light boat, skiff’, while OE *scegð* renders L *trieris* ‘a ship or galley of three ranges of oar-banks, a trireme’ (cp. AntGl 6 (Kindschi) 476 = BrGl 1 (Wright-Wülcker) 2.58, where the term is presented as the only gloss for that Latin lemma). That L *trieris* does not refer to a small ship is suggested by the so-called Corpus Glossary, where the term is explained as ‘magna navis tribus’ (‘big ship with three’) (see CorpGl 2 (Hessels) 18.253).

<sup>73</sup> ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1008 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1008 = ChronE (Irvine) 1008 = ChronF (Baker) 1008 tells us that King Æthelred demanded that each district of three hundred and ten hides should provide a *scegð*, a helmet, and a mailcoat.

<sup>74</sup> Thier explains that <demonen> here should be understood as a mistake for L *dromonem* (cp. L *dromo*) (Thier 2000b).

*dromo* 'long ship, light naval vessel' in the glossary included in London, British Library, MS Add. 32,246, and the derivative glossary in Brussels, Royal Library, MS 1828–30 (AntGl 6 (Kindschi) 488 = BrGl 1 (Wright-Wülcker) 2.9).<sup>75</sup> The difference between these terms, OE *barð(a)* and *æsc*, seems to be that the latter focuses on the speed of the ship, for it is also used as a gloss for L *cercylus* 'a light, swift, ship' (e.g. EpGl 187 = ErfGl 1 180; see Pheifer 1974: 71 n. 180), and L *liburna* 'light, fast-sailing ship' (ÆGram 29.17), while OE *barð* and *barða* refer to a special stem.

The ship terms discussed in this section do not seem to have survived into the Middle English period. The reasons for this may be not only the fact that they seem to have been fairly peripheral in their lexico-semantic fields (except for OE *scegð*), but also that ship technology and, consequently, terminology changed significantly during the Middle English period (see Sandhal 1951–82, and Friel 1995).

**(B) CREW-MEMBER: CREW-MEMBER OF A *SCEGÐ* (OE *scegðmann*)**

Due to the violent acts committed by those manning *skeiðar* (pl. of OIc *skeið*), Ælfric considered OE *sceigðmann* to be synonymous with OE *wicing* (on which see below, III.3.1.E), and a good *interpretamentum* for L *pirata* 'pirate' (see ÆGram 24.9). In this respect, the term could be seen as well as a (near)synonym of OE *ascmann*, which is also commonly used to refer to Scandinavian marauders (see below, III.3.1.A) and, as far as Ælfric's idiolect is concerned, of OE *flotmann*. The latter renders L *pirata* in a double gloss with OE *wicing* in ÆGl 302.11 (cp. AldV 1 (Goossens) 3926), and it commonly appears in Ælfrician prose in connection with the Scandinavians (see, for instance, the various uses of the term in ÆLS (Edmund); cp. the *TOE*: 05.12.01.09.03.03). This may suggest that the association of the Norse-derived term with piracy has to do more with its reference to navigation than with its particular association with the Scandinavians (cf. Fell 1986: 302).

Interestingly, a contemporary text to Ælfric's glossary, viz. *II Æthelred*, apparently uses the Norse-derived compound in a slightly different way, probably indicating ethnicity rather than the activities that those referred to may have been involved in. While initially the text refers to the two parties entering the agreement with the adjectives OE *english* and *denisc* (see LawIIAtr 5–5.1), the terminology changes towards the end: LawIIAtr 7 contrasts OE *landesmann* with OE *scegðmann* to indicate, respectively, the English and the Danes.

<sup>75</sup> On the relationship between these glossaries, see below, II.6.

As Fell points out, ‘one can scarcely call the person with whom one is actually making a treaty, and calling on as a legal witness, a “pirate”. In this context *scegð-man* must be intended as descriptive or even ethnic’ (Fell 1986: 312).

As expected, though, once OE *scegð* lost its initial association with the ships of the Scandinavian marauders, OE *scegðmann* was no longer used in connection with them either. Thus, we encounter it as a by-name for a crewmember of an English ship in a document dealing with some lands in Herefordshire datable to 1016 x 1035 (viz. Ch 1462 (Rob 78); see Robertson 1939: 400–01; cp. the OE *lagu* word-field, see above, 3.4.2.2.C.3).<sup>76</sup>

(C) PARTS OF THE SHIP: ROWLOCK (OE *hā*, *hamele*)<sup>77</sup>

While some Norse-derived terms referring to ship types are recorded relatively early, the same cannot be said about the remaining naval terms. Except for OE *hamele* (on which see above, 3.4.2.3.A), and the problematic attestation of OE *hā* in Ch 1492 (Nap-Steven 10) (see below), their use is restricted to texts included in Group 6, i.e. to the late Old English period (see below, I.40.1, I.42, and I.45). Given the increase in detail, these terms may reflect a closer Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact: it may have taken a while for the terms to be incorporated into English (either through borrowing or through imposition by the Scandinavian settlers, who shared a sailing background) and for them to make their way from the oral to the written medium.

As noted above, 3.4.2.3.A, the use of OE *hamele* in the expression ‘æt hamelan’ recorded in ChronD (Cubbin) 1040 = ChronE (Irvine) 1039 (cp. ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1040) seems to be associated with people of Scandinavian origin. Such association is not present, though, as far as OE *hā* is concerned; this noun is likely to be recorded in connection with OE *scegð* in Bishop Ælfwold’s will (see above, 3.4.2.5.A), although, as pointed out in 2.2.1.5.A, the attestation of the term in this context is problematic. Given their limited attestation, the two terms appear to have been fairly peripheral members of their lexico-semantic field. However, we should note that the other terms that the *TOE* (05.12.01.09.03.01.03) records as (near)synonyms of the

<sup>76</sup> See, however, Dobson 1976: 25 on the Scandinavian influence in Herefordshire.

<sup>77</sup> See Jesch 2001b: 155–57 for a discussion of the possibility that the terms may refer not to part of a ship, but to a unit of men. She concludes that, while ChronD (Cubbin) 1040 = ChronE (Irvine) 1039 (cp. ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1040) in effect refer to ‘payment for a certain number of crew (although we do not know how many would be considered to be in a *hamele*), we cannot [...] take the further step in asserting that either *há* or *hamla* had the meaning “unit of men”, in either OE or ON in the eleventh century’ (Jesch 2001b: 157; cp. Syrett 2002: 143–44). Cf. Thier 2002: 106 and 136.



loan-words, viz. OE *ārloc*, *ārmidl*, *ārwiððe*, *midl*, and *strop*, are also used very infrequently in Old English texts, which could be taken as an indication that the lack of frequency of OE *hā* and *hamele* could be attributed, not to their status in their lexico-semantic field, but to the rare mention of their *denotatum* in Old English texts. In any case, Middle English texts only record reflexes of OE *ārloc* (see the *MED*: s.v. *ōr-lok*), which may indicate that this was or became in time the core member of the field.

#### (D) TO STEER A SHIP (OE *healdan*)

OE *healdan* with the uncommon meaning ‘to steer (a ship)’ is only recorded in a batch of annals of northern provenance, in ChronE (Irvine) 1075, an annal which, despite being associated with the aforementioned northern batch, has undergone significant changes (see below, 4.2.1), and in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1052 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2, an annal with heavy use of Norse-derived nautical terminology (see above, 3.4.2.3.A, and below, I.45). This is clearly a very peripheral meaning for the verb, and, as we may expect, it is not recorded in Middle English texts (see the *MED*: s.v. *hōlden*, v.1). More common is the use of OE *lædan* and, mainly, *stieran* / *stēoran*, the only two Old English terms which the *TOE* (05.12.01.09) records as meaning ‘to steer’ (see, for instance, ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.16 and 19). Unfortunately, neither term appears in the same batches of annals as OE *healdan*, so it is not possible to establish further semantic or stylistic relations between the terms.

### 3.4.2.6. Social status

#### (A) SOCIAL CLASS

Notably, the first Norse-derived social terms to be attested in Old English texts refer to the two opposite extremes in the social ladder: lords and slaves.

##### (A.1) SLAVE (OE *ðīr* and *ðrǣll*)

The two Norse-derived terms meaning ‘slave’ recorded in Old English texts differ in various respects: on the one hand, while OE *ðīr* is clearly used to refer to a female slave in its only attestation, OE *ðrǣll* does not seem to have been equally gender specific; on the other hand, while OE *ðīr* is only attested in two closely related contexts (viz. JnGl (Li) 18.17 = JnGl (Ru) 18.17; see below, I.89), OE *ðrǣll* seems to have enjoyed more popularity during the Old English period (see below, I.91.1): not only is its reflex still used in Present Day English (see the *OED* 1989: s.v. *thrall*, n.1 (a.1)), but the term also became productive (OE *ðrǣlriht*; think as well of ME *thraldōm* ‘servitude, bondage’).



OE *ðir* in Aldred's (and Owun's) glosses renders, together with OE *ðignen*, L *ancilla* 'maid-servant, handmaid, female slave'. Neither noun in the double gloss seems to have been the core term in Aldred's idiolect to refer to a female slave. OE *ðēowa* is more commonly used as an *interpretamentum* for L *ancilla* (see e.g. MtGl (Li) 26.69, and MkGl (Li) 14.69), and on the two occasions that OE *ðignen* renders the Latin term, it appears in a double gloss (cp. LkGl (Li) 22.56, where it is given as an alternative to OE *ðēowa*). It is interesting that Aldred's favourite noun to render the gender-specific Latin term is a word that is not gender specific (cf. Ælfric's OE *wielen*, e.g. ÆGram 104.12, and OE *mennen* in various glosses to the psalms, e.g. PsGIL (Lindelöf) 85.16 = PsGIJ (Oess) 85.16 = PsGIH (Campbell) 85.16 = PsGIA (Kuhn) 85.15 = PsGIG (Rosier) 85.16 = PsGID (Roeder) 85.16 = PsGLB (Brenner) 85.16).

Aldred uses OE *ðræll* much more frequently than OE *ðir*, always as a gloss for L *servus* 'slave, servant, serf, serving-man; a female slave, maid-servant'. The term can appear either by itself (e.g. MtGl (Li) 24.50) or in a double gloss with OE *esne* 'labourer, slave, servant, retainer, young man' (e.g. MkGl (Li) 10.44); when rendering L *servus*, it also alternates with other terms such as OE *ðēow* 'servant, slave' (e.g. MtGl (Li) 10.25) and *ðegn* 'slave; servant, follower, disciple' (e.g. MtGl (Li) 13.28; see further below, 4.3.1).

As I have explained elsewhere (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 181–89, and Pons-Sanz 2007d), Aldred only tends to use OE *ðræll* in contexts associated with the idea of slavery, either literal or metaphoric, and this association seems to have remained during the Old English period, as well as during later uses of the term (see the *MED*: s.v. *thral*, n.1, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *thrall*, n1 (a.1)). We next encounter the Norse-derived noun in LawIIAtr 5.1 and the Wulfstanian canon. In the latter, OE *ðēow* is the more common term used to render the meanings 'servant' and 'slave', but in those contexts where Wulfstan wants to emphasize that he is talking about a slave and not a servant in general (e.g. WHom 9 128) he selects the Norse-derived noun instead of the ambiguous native noun (cp. his use of OE *lagu* instead of OE *æ(w)*; see above, 3.4.2.2.A).<sup>78</sup> The possibility for semantic specialization offered by the term might have been very important for its survival. The reader should refer to my aforementioned publications for a more extensive discussion of the use of OE *ðræll* in the Aldredian and Wulfstanian corpora.

<sup>78</sup> There is only one Old English context where OE *ðræll* does not clearly mean either 'slave' or 'servant', viz. ÆColl 201, where it renders L *cocus* 'cook'. The selection of the Norse-derived term in this context remains puzzling, although Garmonsway (Garmonsway 1978: 37 n. to l. 201) suggests that the Norse-derived term is used in this context because it clearly contrasts with OE *blaford* 'lord', which renders L *dominus* 'lord'.

**(A.2) FREEDMAN (OE *l̥ysing*)**

The *TOE* (12.01.01.10.01) gives OE *fr̥eol̥æta*, *fr̥eolsmann*, and *fr̥eotmann* as (near)synonyms of OE *l̥ysing* ‘freedman’. Of them OE *fr̥eotmann* seems to have been the core member of the lexico-semantic field, for the *DOE* does not record OE *fr̥eolsmann*, and all the occurrences of OE *fr̥eol̥æta* are restricted to glossaries (see the *DOE*: s.v. *fr̥eo-l̥æta*, *fr̥ig-l̥æta*). Given the distribution of the Norse-derived term, the difference between it and the main native equivalent seems to lie in their dialectal distribution (see the *DOE*: s.v. *fr̥eot-mann*), rather than in semantic or stylistic issues (see above, 3.3.1 and 3.3.6). It is noteworthy that the specific association of OE *l̥ysing* with the Scandinavians and their practices is emphasized in the treaty between Alfred and Guthrum, where the same amount of money should be paid for *their* (i.e. the Danes’) freedmen (‘*heora liesengum*’) and for the *ceorl* who occupies rented land (LawAGu 2).

None of the terms belonging to this lexico-semantic field survived into the Middle English period. This may be due to the fact that, as suggested by Pelteret (Pelteret 1995: 48), the legal differentiation between ordinary freemen and those who were free after having been manumitted was not of great significance in late Anglo-Saxon law.

**(A.3) FREEMAN (OE *bōnda*)**

The Norse-derived terms referring to the middle layers in society are not attested until the early eleventh century. However, the fact that the texts included in Group 4 record two members of the OE *bōnda* word-field in two independent textual groups not associated with the Scandinavianized areas can be taken as an indication that the word-field is likely to have been in use for a while before it made its way into the textual records (at least as far as we can tell; see above, 3.3.4). Interestingly, only OE *bōndeland* is clearly associated with the Scandinavianized areas; this may be indicative of the compound’s distribution during the Old English period because it is not attested again until 1423, when it also appears in a document from East Anglia (see the *MED*: s.v. *bōnde-lōnd*). This suggestion, however, has to remain purely speculative.

OE *bōnda* had two main meanings, ‘free peasant farmer, husbandman’ and ‘head of a household’ (*DOE*: s.v. *bōnda*). This section discusses the first meaning; the second meaning is discussed below, in 3.4.2.6.B.1. The *TOE* (12.01.01.10) gives OE *ceorl*, *ceorlmann*, and *fr̥eomann* as (near)synonyms of the Norse-derived term when it has the meaning under consideration in this section. Of them, we can leave out of the discussion OE *ceorlmann*, for it is only attested on five occasions in Latin contexts rendering various Anglo-Saxon laws in the twelfth-century *Instituta Cnuti* and the *Quadripartitus* (see

the *DOE*: .v. *ceorl-mann*, and Wormald 1999: 236–44 and 350–51). Of the remaining terms, OE *bōnda* is semantically closest to OE *ceorl*, because OE *frēomann*, when indicating legal status, could be seen as the superordinate term referring to any free man; indeed, this Old English noun is commonly rendered by *L liber (homo)* ‘free (man)’ (see, for instance, the *Quadripartitus* translation of LawIAtr 1; see Liebermann 1903–16: I, 216–17), and it frequently appears in legal(istic) texts in opposition to OE *ðēow* ‘slave; servant’ (e.g. LawAf 1 43 and Conf 1.1 134). OE *ceorl* and *bōnda*, on the other hand, tend to appear in opposition to other terms referring to freemen, thus presenting different social strata within the realm of freemen (e.g. LawVIIaAtr 3 contrasts OE *bōnda* with OE *ðræll* ‘slave’ and *ðegn*, on which see below, 3.4.2.6.A.4; cp. Wol 6.2 (Jost) 135; LawAf 1 4.2 contrasts the echoic OE *ceorl* and *eorl*).<sup>79</sup>

OE *ceorl* is clearly the core member of this lexico-semantic field, for OE *bōnda* is restricted in the main to the Wulfstanian corpus, particularly to Wulfstan’s later texts (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 173–76). Wulfstan’s works are the first to record the term; therefore, it is difficult to know whether later attestations should be interpreted as signs of the term’s wider popularity or as indications of the impact which Wulfstanian lexical practices are likely to have had on later Old English texts (cp. Wulfstan’s likely popularization of OE *griðbryce* and *unlagu*; see above, 3.4.2.2.C.3, and Pons-Sanz 2007b: 234–35 and 237–39).

#### (A.4) FREEMAN OF RANK (OE *hūscarl*, *hold*, and *eorl*)

In late Anglo-Saxon / Scandinavian and early Anglo-Norman England there were a series of terms referring to a freeman of high social status (someone between the *ceorl* and the *ealdormann* / *eorl*, particularly on the basis of being a member of a king’s or another nobleman’s household), which seem to overlap in meaning and act on occasions as interchangeable terms. This section will focus on the relationship between OE *ðegn*, *cniht*, and *hūscarl*.

Loyn traces the semantic evolution of OE *ðegn* from a term meaning ‘(young) slave’ in early Old English to a term referring to a freeman who serves a noble or a king (Loyn 1955: 540–49). He explains that, while it originally referred to someone who served a lord in a personal capacity, in late Old English texts (particularly when it referred to a king’s retainer) it became the normal term to mention a noble engaged in the business of helping to govern the realm by, for instance, administering law in shire and hundred courts (cp. Stenton 1961: 116; see also Keynes 1999b).<sup>80</sup>

<sup>79</sup> On the semantic changes undergone by the Middle English reflex of OE *ceorl*, see Rinelli 2003.

<sup>80</sup> The term, though, remained polysemous, always used in connection with some sort of

In the late tenth and early eleventh century, OE *cniht*, which originally also referred to a young servant, seems to have undergone as well a process of semantic melioration. As explained by Gillingham (Gillingham 1995: 138–39), the two *cnihts* (Wulfstan's son and Offa's kinsman) mentioned in *The Battle of Maldon* seem to be young noblemen who are in the service of Ealdorman Byrhtnoth. Similarly, Osulf, a kinsman of Bishop Oswald, is a noble landowner who is explicitly referred to as *cniht* in Ch 1326 (Rob 46), and in Ch 1503 (Whitelock 20) a certain Ælfmær is presented both as the *discðegn* 'seneschal' of Ætheling Æthelstan, the son of Æthelred the Unready, and as a *cniht* (see Whitelock 1930: 170). In this respect, as retainers of a nobleman, the *cnihts* seem to overlap with the thegns (cp. the *DOE*: s.v. *cniht*, sense 3), although we do not tend to find this title used for people closely involved with running the Anglo-Saxon / Scandinavian state.

OE *hūscarl*, which is first attested in one of Cnut's charters (see below, I.10.4), overlaps in many ways with these two terms, although it differs from them in lacking, as we would expect from a loan, the wide range of meanings of the native terms and, closely associated with this, the wide range of registers they can be associated with (see Loyn 1955: 543–49). OE *hūscarl*, on the contrary, is restricted to legal documents and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Historians have long debated about the role of Cnut's and his successors' housecarls. While they have sometimes been identified as a standing army, Hooper has shown that they should rather be seen as members of the king's or a nobleman's household, who may, like others, have some military obligations: 'in most respects they differed little from the *milites* of other princely households, whether they were described as thegns, chevaliers or housecarls in the appropriate vernacular' (Hooper 1992a: 11). Thus, the three terms discussed so far can all be considered to be hyponyms of OE *hiredmann* 'retainer, follower' (on this term, see III.4.JJ): e.g. in Ch 1422 (Rob 74) we encounter the *cnihts* Ælfget and Ælwerd as part of Ætheling Edmund Ironside's *hiredmenn*, and ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.12 = ChronE (Irvine) 1064.2 refers to Earl Tostig's *hiredmenn* where ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065.10 calls them *hūscarlas*. Just like there seem to have been various strata of thegns and *cnihts*, Hooper explains that the Norse-derived compound 'was not applied to a well-defined and unique body of men. On the contrary, it is simply one of a number of possible words for a member of a royal or noble household' (Hooper 1992a: 14). Its

service; thus, for instance, it commonly refers to Christ's disciples and religious men following in their footsteps (see, for instance, ÆLS (Sebastian)).

introduction and integration into Old English, then, does not seem to be associated with the introduction of a new office, but rather with the linguistic practices of the Cnutian court, which incorporated many Scandinavians. Indeed, Hooper (Hooper 1992a: 14–15) suggests that the main reason for the use of OE *hūscarl* as opposed to OE *ðegn* when referring to a member of a king's or nobleman's household who lived at court or in their own estate (or alternated between the two) appears to have been the Scandinavian origin of the person referred to (or, as in the case of the Richard mentioned in Ch 1157 (Harm 116), his foreign origin; cp. Hooper 1992a: 14–15, and Nightingale 1984: 244). The attestations of OE *hūscarl* are in no way restricted to texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas, though (see above, 3.3.4–6), and this is likely to derive, at least partially, from the backing given to its use by the Cnutian secretariat.

Yet it is clear that OE *ðegn* remained the core member of this lexico-semantic field. While its wide range of meanings and uses helped it to survive the linguistic impact of the Norman Conquest (see the *MED*: s.v. *thein*), the same cannot be said about OE *hūscarl*. The compound, other than as a surname, does not seem to have survived for a long time after the Norman Conquest, its use in the Peterborough Interpolation in the 1070-annal being the only attestation recorded by the *MED* (s.v. *hōus-carl*). The Norman conquerors brought not only new members to the nobility's households, but also the terminology to refer to them, which made it very difficult for the terms attested during the Old English period to survive (see Singh 2005: 107 and 124; cp. Kibbee 1991: chs 2 and 3, and Crane 1999).

As indicated above, 3.3.1–2, OE *bold* is mainly attested in texts from the Scandinavianized areas; when this is not the case, as in the *Chronicle* annals included in Group 1, it is only used in connection with Scandinavian leaders. Larson (Larson 1935: 12) explains that, in Norwegian laws, *hauldr* referred to a member of ancient families whose ancestry, as far as it was known, was of free origin on both sides of the house, and who were in possession of allodial land. Thus, the *hauldr* had a social position between those of a *bóndi* and a *jarl*. The term, though, does not seem to have had a very long lifespan in Old English: it is last recorded in Old English texts in Aldred's glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and Owun's related glosses to the Rushworth Gospels, although the attestation of the place-name *Holderness* in 1086 (see English 1979 and V. Watts and others 2004: s.v. *Holderness Drain*) may point towards a somewhat more extended use than the extant Old English texts would allow us to infer. The reason for this short life is likely to have been that the term does not seem to fit any of the social strata which were familiar to the Anglo-Saxons (cp. Björkman 1901: 7; cp. OE *lýsing*; see above, 3.4.2.6.A.2).

OE *hold* glosses L *tribunus* ‘chieftain, commander, tribune (officer in the Roman administration)’ in the Northumbrian glosses. Aldred’s preferred terms to render the Latin lemma, though, were OE *forwost* (on which see below, III.3.2.G), a noun meaning ‘leader’ accompanied by ‘his cynnes’ (‘his peoples’), and OE *ealdormann*, a term referring to someone of authority (see further below and 4.3.1) which is commonly used in Old English glosses to render Latin titles of secular offices (see the *DOE*: s.v. *ealdormann*, sense II.A.1). In a sense, then, Aldred may have used the Norse-derived term with the same general meaning as OE *ealdormann*, i.e. simply as a reference to someone with authority, without paying attention to the specific social position of the person involved.

Stafford (Stafford 1999: 152) explains that OE *ealdormann* began its life as the vernacular equivalent of a range of Latin titles such as *princeps*, *dux*, and *praefectus*, i.e. it is likely to have first been coined as a Latin-derived loan-rendition.<sup>81</sup> By the tenth century it was used as a title for a local ruler, the highest officer in the shire, acting on the king’s behalf. Although OE *eorl* referring to someone in a position of authority is first attested in Old English texts in connection with the Scandinavian newcomers and the areas where they settled (e.g. LawEGu 12), we already encounter it in the texts of Archbishop Wulfstan of York as a synonym of OE *ealdormann*. In fact, as I have shown elsewhere (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 176–81 and 226), the Archbishop only uses the native term when he follows the wording of a previous text; otherwise, the Norse-derived semantic loan is clearly his favourite term, to a certain extent because the term allows him to exploit the echoic effects derived from the pair *eorl-ceorl* (e.g. LawGrið 21.2 = WPol 6.2 (Jost) 137).

It is, however, mainly in texts from Cnut’s reign onwards that we start to see the use of the Norse-derived noun without any specific association with the Scandinavian newcomers (see e.g. LawCn 18 26–26.4 = LawIICn 15.2). The popularization of the term is likely to be associated with Cnut’s division of the kingdom into four regions (viz. Northumbria, Mercia, East Anglia, and Wessex), three of which were in the hands of Scandinavians (see ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1017 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1017 = ChronE (Irvine) 1017 = ChronF (Baker) 1017; see further Lawson 1993: 114–15, and Keynes 1994: 81–82), and with the prominence given to Scandinavian earls during his reign

<sup>81</sup> On Latin-derived loan-translations and loan-renditions in Old English, see further Gneuss 1955 and Gretschi 2001: 54; see also below, 3.4.2.13.A.



(see Lawson 1993: 184–89, Keynes 1994, and Bolton 2009: Part One).<sup>82</sup> We should not forget, though, that the frequent use of the term in late Old English texts should also be associated with the formulaic character of Old English legal texts, which helped the Norse-derived semantic loan to replace the native term as the core member of their lexico-semantic field in late Old English texts. In LawCn 1020 1 OE *eorl* is used as a common noun in the general address of the letter, and this use, and the reference to other important secular and religious roles in the kingdom, is paralleled in Cnutian charters (e.g. Ch 986 (Harm 28); cp. Ch 992 (Harm 53)) as well as in charters attributed to later kings (e.g. Ch 1032 (Rob 120) and Ch IWm (Farrer 12); cp. Sharpe 2003: 249 and 251–52).

The change in terminology seems to coincide with a change in administrative practices:

one senses a development away from a system of government in which each of the constituent districts of the kingdom was governed by an ealdorman appointed by the king from among the local nobility, and towards a system which relied at the local level more directly on a network of lesser officials; and it may have been under these circumstances that kings gained greater freedom to appoint ealdormen, or earls, at their own pleasure, assigning them responsibility for whatever district, or combination of districts, was deemed appropriate or necessary at the time. (Keynes 1994: 78)<sup>83</sup>

However, given that Keynes explains that this development had its roots in the tenth century and could already be seen during the reign of King Æthelred, it is better to associate the change in terminology with the origin of the king and many of his magnates rather than with changes associated with the office involved (cp. OE *hūscarl*). As noted by Lewis (C. P. Lewis 1991: 210–15), in pre- and post-Conquest texts OE *eorl* is also used to refer to Norman counts

<sup>82</sup> It is interesting to see, for instance, how the F-manuscript replaces some uses of OE *ealdormann* with OE *eorl* (e.g. cf. ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 845.1–2 and ChronF (Baker) 845.1; see II.163.22.2). On one occasion, ChronF (Baker) 694.34, this version of the *Chronicle* presents OE *eorl* and *ealdormann* next to each other, probably as translations of L *princeps* 'prince, ruler' in the Latin version of the annal. It is difficult to know how to interpret this usage, for only OE *ealdormann* renders the Latin term in ChronF (Baker) 694.23; it may be that the scribe treated the terms as (near)synonyms, one, viz. OE *eorl*, which was anachronistic as far as the date of the annal was concerned, and one, viz. OE *ealdormann*, which he knew to be appropriate for the annal but outdated as far as his/her own usage was concerned.

<sup>83</sup> For later developments in connection with the king's freedom to choose his earls, see C. P. Lewis 1991: 208–09.



(e.g. Earl Robert in ChronF (Baker) 1031.3; see below, II.163.22.5).<sup>84</sup> By the end of the Old English period OE *eorl* had fully replaced OE *ealdormann* when referring to contemporary affairs,<sup>85</sup> as suggested by the fact that the native compound is not recorded in the *MED*.<sup>86</sup> Accordingly, the OE *eorl* word-field increased during the Old English period so as to refer to various issues associated with this social group (cp. OE *eorldōm*, *eorlgyfu*, and *eorlriht*), although, interestingly, only once the term had stopped being specifically associated with the Scandinavians and their social arrangements (see above, 2.4.1.B).

## (B) PERSONAL RELATIONS

### (B.1) HEAD OF THE HOUSEHOLD (OE *bōnda* word-field)

OE *bōnda* and *hūsbonða* act as (near)synonyms when they mean 'head of the household'. Riedinger (Riedinger 1994) notes that, in all its occurrences in Old English texts, OE *hūsbonða* means only 'head of the household', not 'husband'.<sup>87</sup> In Riedinger's view, the semantic change from 'head of the household' to 'husband' which this compound seems to have undergone by the early Middle English period can be associated with a change in the social conditions surrounding the married couple: the apparent equality between husband and wife, represented by the fact that the most common terms used to express the meaning 'husband' and 'wife' (i.e. OE *wer* / *ceorl*, and *wīf*) could also mean simply 'man' and 'woman', is replaced by a new feudal system, in which the husband is clearly the dominant figure.

The semantic change undergone by OE *hūsbonða* may have been facilitated by the fact that OE *bōnda*, besides 'head of the household' (see LawIICn 72, where the *Quadripartitus* renders the term as L *paterfamilias* 'head of a family, master of the house'; see Liebermann 1903–16: I, 358–59), seems to have meant 'husband' as well (see LawIICn 76, where the *Quadripartitus* renders the term as L *sponsus* 'husband', and Rec 10.2 (Hickes)). Interestingly, though, the two occurrences of the simplex with the meaning 'husband' can be found in legal texts, and, indeed, this term seems to have been a fairly peripheral member

<sup>84</sup> On the change in the Latin terminology to render OE *eorl* in post-Conquest texts from L *dux* to L *comes*, see C. P. Lewis 1991: 212–22.

<sup>85</sup> Note, however, the alternation between OE *ealdormann* and *eorl* in the *Life of St Nicholas* as translations of L *consul* and *dux* (e.g. LS 29 (Nicholas) 388 and 397); the two terms function as synonyms in the text.

<sup>86</sup> For a general overview of the Old English vocabulary of nobility, see Roberts 2000.

<sup>87</sup> On the use of the compound to render L *hospita* 'hostess' in Exod 3.22, see Kornexl's detailed study (Kornexl 2006; see above, note 129 in Chapter 2).

of the lexico-semantic field. As noted by Riedinger (Riedinger 1994: 7), OE *bōnda* is not used in any context where marriage is the subject, and LawIICn 76 is included in a context which describes the legal rights and obligations of free-men (OE *bōndan*). It is mainly in Rec 10.2 (Hickes) where the term is used as the counterpart of OE *wif*, but, as explained below, II.246, this is a very late text and, therefore, the selection of OE *bōnda* here can be seen as a clear precursor of the usage of ME *housbōnde*.

The fact that OE *hūs bōnda* could be used as an equivalent to L *paterfamilias* may have contributed to the success of the term, because the extant records appear to suggest that the Anglo-Saxons did not have a lexicalized form to render this useful concept: e.g. Ælfric renders the term as OE *hīredes blaford* in ÆGI 301.10, while the Old English version of the *Rule of St Benet* translates it as OE *hīredes ealdor*, and Aldred as OE *fæder hīredes* (MtGI (Li) 21.33 and 24.43, and LkGI (Li) 13.25) and *fæder hīwisc* (LkGI (Li) 13.25 and 14.21).

### (B.2) LEADER (OE *hofding*)

OE *hofding* is one of the Old English terms which the *TOE* (12.01.01.04) records with the meaning 'leader, ruler'. The northern annals where the term is recorded (see below, I.47) do not attest any of the (near)synonyms suggested by the *TOE*. Therefore, it is difficult to know what semantic and stylistic relations may have existed between the term and its (near)synonyms in the chronicler's / chroniclers' idiolect(s) or dialect(s). Interestingly, though, ChronE (Irvine) 1075 records OE *yldest* (on which see below, note 44 in Appendix III) instead of the Norse-derived term. This could be taken as an indication that the term had a particularly Northern character (cp. OE *forwost*, on which see below, III.3.2.G, and *forelāttēow*) and that speakers in other dialectal areas may have not been familiar with it (see below, 4.2.1). There are no hints of a wider use in later years, for it is not recorded in either Middle or Modern English texts. Thus, textual attestations suggest that the noun had a fairly limited lifespan, both from a chronological and a dialectal perspective.

### 3.4.2.7. Communication

#### (A) TO CRY ALOUD (OE *ceallian*)

The *TOE* gives only OE *ceallian* and *hlýdan* as meaning 'to speak loud, cry aloud' (*TOE*: 02.05.10.15.01). Of them, the native term is clearly the more common term, OE *ceallian* being recorded only once in the *OEC*, in the poem *The Battle of Maldon* (see below, I.11). Dance (Dance 1999: 149) hypothesizes that the verb may have been chosen in the *Maldon*-passage due to the echoic effect

resulting from its phonological similarity to the Anglian variant of the adjective OE *ceald* 'cold' (i.e. *cald*), with which it alliterates and shares internal rhyme.

Given the problematic character of *The Battle of Maldon*, it is not possible to establish a clear association of the first attestation of the term with the Scandinavianized areas (see below, 4.2.4). What is evident, though, is that by the early Middle English period its use was in no way restricted to these areas, as suggested by its presence in Dance's corpus of early Middle English South-West Midland texts (Dance 2003).

#### (B) TO URGE ON, INCITE (OE *eggian*)

OE *eggian* renders L *concitare* 'to incite, excite, rouse up' in MkGl (Li) 15.11 in a double gloss together with OE *weccan*, which is one of the alternatives that Owun used in the same context. Given that Owun commonly agrees with Aldred's lexical choices (see below, II.168), it is interesting that he chose OE *cīegdan* instead as the second alternative in his double gloss (see further below, 4.2.3). This could be taken as an indication of the lack of popularity of the verb, although the fact that we encounter it in early Middle English texts from the South-West Midlands (see Dance 2003) may suggest a different story.

Unfortunately, the Latin verb only occurs in the aforementioned passage in the Aldredian glosses, so it is difficult to judge the position of the verb in its lexico-semantic field as far as the glossator's own idiolect is concerned. What seems clear, though, is that the other verb which renders the Latin verb in the double Aldredian gloss, viz. OE *weccan*, is one of the most widely preferred choices to render the Latin verb in Old English texts (e.g. AldV 1 (Goossens) 4298 = AldV 13.1 (Nap) 4420, and various versions of the Psalms, e.g. PsGlC (Wildhagen) 77.17 = PsGLE (Harsley) 77.17 = PsGlA (Kuhn) 77.19 = PsGLB (Brenner) 77.17). The popularity of the native verb may have granted it its position as the first alternative in the double Aldredian gloss, but this is difficult to prove because seemingly uncommon terms such as OE *flēge* and *ðīr* also appear as the first alternative in a double gloss (see above, 3.4.2.5.A and 3.4.2.6.A.1, respectively).

#### 3.4.2.8. Life, death, and existence

All the terms belonging to this lexico-semantic field are first attested relatively late in the Old English period (see above, 3.3.6), with the possible exception of OE *hæil*, whose date of attestation remains unclear (see above, 3.3.7, and below, II.257). This is not particularly surprising, given their non-technical character, although an earlier attestation of the adjective OE *norren* would not

have raised any suspicion either because it refers to the origin of some of the Scandinavian attackers.

Even though the initial attestation of some of the terms is clearly associated with the Scandinavianized areas (viz. OE *ærfle*, *band*, *norren*, *rennan*, *rōtfeſt*, and *swegen*), this dialectal restriction is no longer visible during the Middle English period, with the possible exception of the reflexes of OE *ærfle*, *norren*, and *rōtfeſt*, and, as far as the early Middle English period is concerned, *rennan* (see the *MED*: s.v. *bond*, *norrene*, *rennen*, v.1, *rōte*, n.4, sense 9, and *swein*, and below, 3.4.2.8.A.3 and 3.4.2.8.C).<sup>88</sup> Notably, Dance's corpus of early Middle English texts from the South-West Midlands already records cases of ME *bond*, *norrene*, and *swein* (Dance 2003). The attestation of the remaining terms is not strongly associated with the Scandinavianized areas during either the Old or the Middle English period (see the *MED*: s.v. *carl*, *crōked*, *heil*, adj., *rōte*, n.4, and *stōre*, adj., and Dance 2003).

## (A) HUMAN BEINGS AND ANIMALS

### (A.1) MALE AND FEMALE BEINGS (OE *carlmann*, *carlfugol*, and *cwenfugol*)

ME *carl* is well attested in texts from different dialectal areas as a social term and, as a result of a process of semantic pejoration similar to that undergone by ME *cherl* (< OE *ceorl*), also as a term of contempt (see the *MED*: s.v. *carl*, and Rinelli 2003). Interestingly, though, in its attestations in Old English texts, OE *carl-* means instead 'male being', a meaning which the Norse etymon exhibits very frequently but which is not as common in English texts.

OE *carlmann* is only attested as far as Old English texts are concerned in an annal of unknown origin (viz. ChronE (Irvine) 1086; see below, I.10.3 and also II.163.21). It appears in the following context: 'gift hwilc carlman hāmde wið wimman hire unðances, sona he forleas þa limu þe he mid pleagode' ('if a [...] man had sex with a woman against her will, he immediately lost the limbs with which he played'). Similar contexts referring to rape (e.g. LawAf 1 11) or to the seventh commandment against adultery (e.g. Deut. 22.22, Conf 5 (Mone) 137)

<sup>88</sup> Note, though, that the by-name OE *bātswegen* 'boatman' is attested in Rec 10.6.4 (Earle), one of the manumissions recorded in the so-called Leofric Missal, i.e. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 315 (part of art. c in Ker 1990: no. 315; see Tengvik 1938: 238). While Rose-Troup (Rose-Troup 1937: 442–43) dates the manumission to c. 1045, Ker explains (Ker 1990: no. 315) that the manumission in his art. c would have been written down in Exeter in or slightly after Bishop Leofric's time (d. 1072). In any case, this attestation may suggest that, already during the Old English period, OE *swegen* did not have a dialectal distribution as restricted as the extant material may suggest; this, of course, has to remain in the realm of speculation, though, because the ancestry of *Wicing bātswegen* is unknown.

use instead OE *mann* or *ceorl* to refer to the man committing the crime/sin. OE *mann* appears on two occasions in the same annal in very close proximity to the Norse-derived term, and, accordingly, we may have expected to find it instead of the compound. Given that the other context where the term has the same meaning is included in the Second Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle* (see below, IV.2.1.C), where it also appears in contrast with the native compound OE *wifmann* ‘woman’, it could be the case that the compound was actually added by the scribe copying ChronE (Irvine) 1086 in order to specify the gender of the person committing the crime (on other cases in this version of the *Chronicle* where lexical changes may be attributable to this stage in the transmission of the annals, see below, 4.2.1 and II.163.18). Accordingly, the term may have been somewhat dialectally restricted. This may be further suggested by the fact that the earliest attestations of ME *carlman* and *carl* seem to be associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see the *MED*: s.v. *carl*). However, we should not forget the puzzling presence of OE *carlfugol* in another text of unknown origin, viz. the so-called *Prose Phoenix*.

The *Prose Phoenix* records the only attestations of OE *carlfugol* and *cwenfugol* (I.10.2 and I.18). Interestingly, the text has a Norse parallel featuring the Old Norse compounds *karlfugl* and *kvennfugl*. As discussed below, II.172, the relationship between the Old English and the Old Norse version remains unclear, although it seems more likely that the Norse version was influenced by the Old English text. If the Norse-derived compounds are not direct translations of the compounds in the Norse text, they can be explained as a result of:

- (1) Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact associated with new waves of Scandinavians coming to England, not necessarily Anglo-Scandinavian England, mainly during Cnut’s reign;
- (2) the return to England of missionaries who had spent time in Scandinavia, who had become somewhat familiar with the language of the people they were trying to convert;
- (3) the reliance on a glossed version of the text, which could have been used by the missionaries mentioned in (2) for teaching or preaching purposes and which may have included the two Old Norse compounds amongst its glosses.

The last option would explain the compounds as arising out of a very particular linguistic situation, which would associate them with the Norse-derived terms recorded in the Old English Orosius (see above, 1.1) and OE *holm*, as far as its attestation in Old English is concerned (see above, 2.4.1.C). If this were the

case, we could not easily claim common use of the compounds, at least as far as certain linguistic groups are concerned, and, therefore, as noted above in 1.1, they should not really be discussed in this monograph.

Whatever the linguistic path leading to the use of the compounds may have been, what is clear is that OE *carlfugol* is included in its text because of the stylistic effect created by its contrast with OE *cwenfugol*: the context presents two echoing compounds joined through their determinatum and through alliteration, a stylistic feature much in the taste of Anglo-Saxon audiences (cp. Chapman 1995 and Chapman 1998). Native lexical practices would not have easily led to such an effect. Old English texts only record four compounds with OE *ceorl* as the determinant, and in three of the four cases OE *ceorl* is used as a term of social status rather than as an indicator of masculinity: OE *ceorl-born* 'low-born, not noble', *ceorlfōlc* 'common people', *ceorlmann* 'man with the rank of a ceorl', and *ceorlstrang* 'strong like a man' (cp. above, 3.4.2.6.A.3).<sup>89</sup> As far as OE *cwen*-compounds are concerned, OE *cwenfugol* can only be compared with OE *cwenhirde*, which glosses L *eunuchus* 'eunuch' in the Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels (MtGl (Li) 19.12). This comparison is not beyond doubt, though, because it may be the case that the determinant of the compound is actually OE *cwēn* 'queen', as suggested by Clark Hall (Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *cwēnhirde*; cf. the DOE: s.v. *cwen-hyrde*). The written records suggest that, when English speakers did not use a different term to differentiate gender (e.g. OE *bicce* 'bitch' vs OE *hund* 'dog', OE *wylf* 'she-wolf' vs OE *wulf* '(he-) wolf'),<sup>90</sup> they preferred OE *wīf* 'woman, female' (and its Middle English reflex) to OE *cwene* to refer to a female being (see the list of compounds with OE / ME *wīf* as the determinant in the MED: s.v. *wīf*, n.2, sense 3, Clark Hall 1960, Sauer 1985: 489 and 512, and Fell 2002: 202; see further Pons-Sanz 2007e).

#### (A.2) YOUNG MAN (?) (OE *swegen*)

Besides OE *carlmann*, the *Peterborough Chronicle* uses another Norse-derived term to refer to a man, viz. OE *swegen* (see below, I.85). It is likely that the term here means 'young man', and, indeed, this is the translation suggested, for instance, by Swanton (Swanton 2000: 258). However, given that it appears in contrast with OE *eorl*, it may also be the case that the term is used,

<sup>89</sup> It is more common to use OE *wāpned-* to create compounds referring to the male sex (e.g. OE *wāpnedbearn* 'male child', *wāpnedcild* 'male child', and *wāpnedmann* 'male, man'; cp. Curzan 2003: 160), but this term is not used to form compounds referring to male animals.

<sup>90</sup> The use of pronouns to create compounds indicative of gender did not develop until the Middle English period (see the MED: s.v. *hē*, pron. 1, and *hē*, pron. 2).



figuratively, with the meaning ‘common man, commoner’, which would bring it closer to the Norse-derived terms referring to social status (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *swein*, sense c; cp. above, 3.4.2.6.A.3).

While the *TOE* does not record OE *swegen*, it suggests that the Old English terms meaning ‘young man’ are OE *geonga*, *hyse*, and *hyserinc* (*TOE*: 02.03.01.06). Unfortunately, the *Peterborough Chronicle* does not record any of these terms, so it is difficult to establish the semantic and stylistic relations which the Norse-derived term under analysis may have established with its (near)synonyms. In any case, it is clear that it is a very peripheral member of its lexico-semantic field.

### (A.3) NORWEGIAN PERSON (OE *norren*)

It is interesting to see an evolution in the Old English terms used to refer to the Scandinavians who attacked and settled in England. This evolution is likely to be the result of an increase in social and linguistic contact between the native inhabitants and the newcomers. The first recorded attack by the Scandinavian marauders took place in 787, and it is described in the E-version of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* as follows:

on his dagum common ærest iii. scipu Norðmanna of Hereðalande, 7 se gerefa þærto rad, 7 he wolde drifan to ðes cininges tune þy he nyste hwæ hi wæron, 7 hine man ofsloh þa; ðæt wæron þa erestan scipu deniscra manna þe Angelcynnes land gesohton.

[in his days came first 3 ships of [*norðmenn*] from [*Hereðaland*] and the reeve rode there and wanted to lead them to the king’s town because he did not know what they were, but they then killed him; those were the first ships of Danish men which sought out the land of the English.]

It is difficult to know how best to interpret this entry. Are we to understand OE *norðmann* in a global sense, which is reminiscent of the Frankish practice of applying *L nortmanni* to those people living in Denmark and further north, OE *Hereðaland* as a reference to Harthæsysæl in Jutland, and OE *denisc* in a national sense? Or are we to understand OE *norðmann* in a national sense, according to which OE *Hereðaland* would be associated with Hörðaland, a district in West Norway, and OE *denisc* in a tribal sense, referring to all Scandinavian peoples (cp. OIc *dönsk tunga* as a reference to Old Norse)? The latter seems to be the preferred option amongst scholars (e.g. Geipel 1971: 32, Higham 1986: 306–07, Keynes 2007: 51, Swanton 2000: 55, and Valtonen 2008: 184–85), but the former option cannot be easily discounted (see Melberg 1949–51: 282; cp. Hadley 2000a: 126).



What seems to be the case is that, as contact with the Scandinavian attackers became longer and closer, the terms used to refer to them also became more accurate (see, for instance, ChronA (Bately) 920, where OE *nordmann* 'Norwegian' is clearly contrasted with OE *denisc* 'Danish'). The adoption of OE *norren* can be seen as the culmination of this process: not only does it have very clear national implications, but it might even be a term that the attackers under consideration would have used to refer to themselves.

As far as Old English texts are concerned, the Norse-derived term under consideration is only attested on three occasions, all in the northern material recorded in ChronD (Cubbin) 1066 and ChronE (Irvine) 1066 (see below, I.64). All three occasions refer to King Harald Hardrada, who is called *se norrena cyng* 'the Norwegian king'. Notably, though, ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.20 refers to him as *Harold cyng of Norwegan* 'Harold king of Norway' in a context which has a parallel in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066 (see Conner 1996: 37, and Baxter 2007b: 1192 n. 16). This may suggest that, while OE *norren* in northern English was perceived as a more accurate alternative to the other terms referring to Scandinavians, it was a dialectally marked term. This may be supported by later material, for ME *norrene* 'Norwegian; Norway' is only recorded in Lazamon's *Brut* and some Lincolnshire and Yorkshire documents (see the *MED*: s.v. *norrene*).

#### (B) PLANTS: ROOT (OE *rōt* word-field)

The *TOE* gives OE *rōt* together with three members of the OE *wyrt* word-field (viz. OE *wyrt*, *wyrtruma*, and *wyrtwala*) as the Old English terms meaning 'root' (*TOE*: 02.07.02.01). Clearly, the members of the OE *wyrt* word-field are the more central members of the lexico-semantic field. However, OE *rōt* seems to have gained some significance by the late Old English period, as it is found in two seemingly unrelated texts of unknown origin (see above, 3.3.6 and 3.3.7, and below, I.70.1). This process continues during the Middle English period, when the term is attested in a wide variety of texts from different dialectal areas (see above, 3.4.2.8, and below, IV.2.1.L). In fact, it is during the Middle English period that the Norse-derived term takes over as the core member of the lexico-semantic field, both in literal and metaphorical meanings, causing a reorganization of the field: ME *wort* is used throughout the Middle English period, albeit mainly when referring to plants or herbs, not so much when referring to roots,<sup>91</sup> ME *wortrume* is last attested c. 1150,<sup>92</sup> and that date also seems to be the

<sup>91</sup> In fact, the *OED* does not record this meaning of the term (*OED* 1989: s.v. *wort*, n<sup>1</sup>).

<sup>92</sup> Interestingly, OE *wyrtruma* in *ÆCHom* II, 30 238.109 and 110 is replaced by ME *rôte* in

cut-off point for the use of ME *wortwāle* with the meaning ‘root’, although the term continues to be used in a fairly specialized meaning, viz. ‘a piece of partly detached skin at the side or base of a fingernail’ (see the *MED*: s.vv. *wort*, n.1, *wortrume* and *wort-wāle*, sense a).

The preference for the Norse-derived term may be the result of the polysemic character of OE *wyrt* (and the impact that this may have had on the compounds where it appears as the determinant), for it could refer not only to the root but also to the whole vegetable or plant. Indeed, the usefulness of the Norse-derived term is apparent in its two repetitive uses in the *Life of St Giles*: it appears in the prepositional phrase ‘be wyrtan rote / an’ (*recte* OE *be wyrtar rōtum* ‘by means of roots of plants’), where the two terms appear together with very different meanings. Notably, though, the authors of the recipes included in the so-called Old English Herbarium (Lch I (Herb)) do not seem to have struggled at all with the combinations OE *wyrte wyrtruma* and *wyrte wyrtwāla*, both of which are frequently used.

The metaphorical uses of ME *rōte* are already visible in Old English texts, where OE *rōtfest* ‘rootfast’ is used figuratively with the sense ‘having strong ties, firmly established’. It may not be by chance that this usage is first attested in a text from a Scandinavianized area (viz. ChronE (Irvine) 1127), for the word-field is likely to have had here a longer lifespan than in other dialectal areas.

### (C) DEATH: A FUNERAL FEAST (OE *ærfle*)

Although the concept of a funeral feast was in no way alien to Anglo-Saxon England (see Thompson 2004: 82–84, and Lee 2007), in Old English there does not seem to have existed a term referring specifically to it. Instead, a term which could be used for different types of feasts is sometimes used to refer specifically to funeral feasts: e.g. OE *feorm* in Rec 9.4 (Thorpe) 14 (see the *DOE*: s.v. *feorm*, sense 2.b).<sup>93</sup> From that perspective, the Norse-derived term offers a further possibility for semantic specialization. However, this may not be the only reason why the term is used in Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8). The text’s reference to a secondary feast is unparalleled in other Anglo-Saxon texts, and, in fact, it has been suggested to record a Scandinavian rather than an Anglo-Saxon practice (see Robertson 1939: 502, and Lee 2007: 112; see further Thompson 2004:

HomU 4 (Belf 13) 4 and 5 (on the relationship between these texts, see below, IV.1.20).

<sup>93</sup> Notably, the *TOE*, which does not record the Norse-derived term under discussion, does not include any reference to a ‘funeral feast’ amongst the different types of feasts mentioned in 04.01.02.04.02. OE *yrfan*, which is translated as ‘to hold a wake’, is recorded amongst terms referring to ‘entertainment with food’ (*TOE*: 04.01.02.04.05).

127, where the significance of the highly elaborate burial furniture referred to in the text is discussed in connection with the seemingly Scandinavian practices recorded in it). If this is the case, the selection of the Norse-derived terms referring to the practices associated with the commemoration of the dead (see also below, 3.4.2.9.A) may be not only dialectally but also culturally appropriate (Robertson 1939: 501 suggests that *Wegen*, the name of the person whose signature appears at the end of the document, represents the Scandinavian name *Vagn*; see also the *EDD*: s.v. *arval*, Thorson 1936: 53, the *MED*: s.v. *arvel*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *arval*).

**(D) SENSATION, FEELING: TO TOUCH** (OE *tacan on*)

As far as the *OEC* is concerned, this phrase is only recorded in the *Life of St Nicholas*, a late text of known origin (see below, 4.2.5, I.86.2, and II.226). Unfortunately, neither this text nor its companion *Life of St Giles* uses any of the native (near)synonyms of the loan (see the *TOE*: 02.05.06). It is therefore very difficult to establish any semantic or stylistic relationships between the terms as far as the author's idiolect/dialect is concerned (see further below, 3.4.2.13.C.3).

**(E) QUALITIES**

**(E.1) BENT, CROOKED** (OE *gecrōcod*)

The *TOE* (02.08.04.02) gives OE *æhīwe*, *gecnycled*, *gecrōcod*, *miscrōced*, *unwlitig*, and *wōhbogen* as the Old English terms meaning 'deformed'. Of them, we can discount OE *æhīwe* 'without colour, without shape or form' as a term with a meaning close enough to OE *gecrōcod* to consider them (near)synonyms, as well as OE *miscrōced*, which is not attested in the *OEC*. OE *gecnycled* 'curved, hook-shaped' and OE *wōhbogen* 'bent, crooked' are only attested once in Old English texts, and, therefore, they may have been as peripheral terms as the Norse-derived term under consideration. It seems then that OE *unwlitig* 'deformed, disfigured' may have been the core term of the lexico-semantic field; unfortunately, though, this adjective does not appear in either the *Life of St Giles* or *St Nicholas*. In any case, it is only during the Middle English period that the reflex of OE *gecrōcod* became one of the core members of the lexico-semantic field and took part in word-formation processes (cp. ME *miscrōked* 'crooked, deformed').

**(E.2) STRONG, VIOLENT** (OE *stōr*)

OE *stōr* is only recorded in ChronE (Irvine) 1085b, where it collocates with the hapax legomenon OE *ḡunring* 'thundering' (see below, I.84). The *TOE*

(05.08.02.01) gives the following Old English adjectives as meaning ‘violent, rough, cruel, fierce’: *grimlic*, *grimm*, *hæst*, *heard*, *stōr*, *strang*, *swiðlic*, *ungerȳde*, and *ungerȳdelic*, but the Old English adjective which tends to collocate with a member of the OE *ḡunor* ‘thunder’ word-field is OE *mycel* ‘great, intense, loud’, although it is occasionally replaced by OE *strang* (see, for instance, *ÆCHom* II, 112.68, and *HomS* 33 (Först) 59 and 70). The Norse-derived adjective seems to have gained popularity during the Middle English period, for it is frequently attested in different contexts in texts from diverse dialectal areas (see above, 3.4.2.8).

### 3.4.2.9. Material needs

Terms referring to some of the most basic necessities, a place to live (OE *toft*) and a place to rest (OE *song*), are already recorded in the second half of the tenth century, that is, fairly soon after the initial settlement of the Scandinavian newcomers (see above, 3.3.2–3). These terms may give us another glimpse at the attempts by Old Norse speakers to get on with normal life in England (see above, note 8 in this chapter), although the circumstances leading to the introduction of the terms into Old English are, of course, difficult to determine.

#### (A) FUEL (OE *ǣlding*)

The only attestation of OE *ǣlding* is recorded in a will from Bury St Edmunds, viz. Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8). The document, which explains the arrangements for the funerary feasts to be celebrated in memory of the deceased, includes various other Norse-derived terms, one of them specifically referring to the funerary feasts themselves, viz. OE *ærfle* (see above, 3.4.2.8.C). The need of fuel for the funerary feast is not something that would have been alien to the Anglo-Saxons because there are suggestions of commemorative feasting and the consumption of food even in Christian times (see Lee 2007: ch. 5; on its use in Scandinavian burials in England, possibly in conjunction with funerary feasts, see J. Richards and others 2004), but, as noted above, 3.4.2.8.C, it may be the case that the choice of particular Norse-derived terms associated with the remembrance of the dead was both dialectally and culturally appropriate.

While the noun under consideration is semantically close to various Old English terms, particularly OE *tynder* ‘fuel; tinder’ and *fōda* ‘food; fuel (transferred sense)’ (see the *TOE*: 17.05.01), the main difference between these terms may lie in the fact that the Norse-derived noun seems to have been dialectally marked, both in Old and Middle English (see above, 2.4.2.A).

**(B) BED (OE *song*)**

OE *song* ‘bed’ is attested on two occasions in the Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels in a very similar context (viz. MkGl (Li) 14.15 and LkGl (Li) 22.12): ‘vobis demonstrabit (/ostendet vobis) caenaculum grande (/magnum) stratum’ (‘will show you a large dining-room in an upper story furnished’). It seems that Aldred mistook the past participle *stratum* (cp. L *sternere* ‘to spread, prepare, arrange’) for the related noun L *stratum* ‘bed; bed-covering’, because in both cases the Norse-derived term appears as the second option in a double gloss with OE *bedd* ‘bed’ rendering L *stratum*. Aldred does not seem to have fallen into the same trap in DurRitGl 2 (Thomp-Lind) 181.3, though, where he glosses L *in lectum stratus mei* (*recte* L *in lectum strati mei*) (‘to the bed of my bedding’?) as OE *on leger brædinges mīnes*.<sup>94</sup>

In any case, what seems clear is that OE *song* is a very peripheral term in its lexico-semantic field, OE *bedd* (see e.g. Mem 128.3, PsGlE (Harsley) 62.7, ClGl 2 (Quinn) 345) being the core member. Indeed, this is the term that Aldred uses most frequently to render L *lectus* ‘bed’ (see e.g. MkGl (Li) 4.21 and LkGl (Li) 5.18), and it may be this central position that granted it its initial place in the (misguided) double glosses it shares with OE *song* (see, however, 3.4.2.7.B). The Norse-derived term seems to have retained its peripheral character throughout its history, remaining in the main a dialectally marked term (see above, 2.4.2.T).

**(C) MARKED SPOT FOR A HOMESTEAD (OE *toft*)**

OE *toft* is the only term that the *TOE* (04.02.03) records as meaning ‘marked spot for a homestead’ (on its extension, see Vinogradoff 1908: 281). This specialized meaning and the echoic effect arising from its co-occurrence with OE *croft* ‘small enclosed field or pasture attached to a dwelling’, much in the taste of the Old English legal technolox,<sup>95</sup> probably contributed to the early development of the formulaic coordination of OE *toft* and *croft* (referring to the holdings with homestead and attached land). This formula is likely to have played a significant role in the popularization of the term: while its earliest attestations are in the main associated with the Scandinavianized areas, as is the

<sup>94</sup> OE *bræding* is a deverbal noun formed on the basis of OE *brædan* ‘to spread, extend’ and, like OE *strēowen*, which is also used to render L *stratum* in various versions of the Psalms (see e.g. PsGIL (Lindelöf) 131.3 and PsGlJ (Oess) 40.4) and which is also related to a verb meaning ‘to spread’ (viz. OE *strewian*), it may be a loan-translation of OE *stratum*.

<sup>95</sup> Cp. OE ‘ne turf ne toft’ (‘neither the soil nor the marked spot for a homestead’) in LawBecwæð 3.

case with the other term referring to material needs, OE *toft* is already recorded in Ch 898 (Kem 705), a document from the borderline between English and Scandinavian Mercia from 1001 (see above, 3.3.3–4, and below, II.13.1.1; see the *EDD*: s.v. *toft*, A. Wall 1898: 84 and 125, Holmberg 1946: 126–38, A. H. Smith 1970: s.v. *toft*, and Astill 1988; cp. Gammeltoft 2001: 19–20).

### 3.4.2.10. Opinion and action

Not surprisingly, the first attestations of the members of this lexico-semantic field are associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see above, 3.3.2–4).

#### (A) OPINION

##### (A.1) BOLD, AUDACIOUS, PRESUMPTUOUS (OE *dearf* word-field)

The *TOE* records the following terms in connection with the meanings ‘bold, presumptuous, impudent’ (*TOE*: 07.06.01.01): OE *beald*, *bræsen*, *dearf*, *dearflic*, *gedyrstig*, and *gedrystlic*. We should note, though, that the members of the OE *dyrstig* word-field are actually recorded with and without the prefix OE *ge*, and the *DOE* lists them separately. Of the native terms mentioned alongside OE *dearf*, we can rule out OE *bræsen* as a clear (near)synonym of OE *dearf* and *dearflic* on the basis that the former is only recorded in poetry and only with positive connotations, meaning ‘mighty, bold, strong’ (see the *DOE*: s.v. *bræsen*, *bresne*). OE *dearf* and *dearflic* differ from the remaining terms in that the native words can be used with positive (cp. OE *gedrystig* as a gloss for L *ausus* ‘daring, bold, courageous’ in MtGl (Li) 22.46) or negative connotations (e.g. OE *dyrstig* and OE *bældo* ‘boldness, arrogance’ are the second members of double glosses shared with OE *dearf* and *dearfscipe* rendering L *audax* ‘audacious, presumptuous, foolhardy’ and L *temeritas* ‘foolhardiness, temerity, rashness’, respectively, in LiProlMt 12), while the members of the OE *dearf* word-field are recorded in Old English texts with negative connotations in all their occurrences but one (viz. LS 29 (Nicholas) 383, the only attestation of the adverb OE *dearflice* in the *OEC*; cp. ME *derfli*, see below).

The members of the OE *dearf* word-field are Aldred’s preferred terms to render the following negative terms: L *temeritas* (LiProlMt 6 and 12) and members of the L *praesumptio* ‘audacity, presumption’ word-field (LiEpis (Skeat) 2 and 6), to the extent that he may be responsible for the coinage of OE *dearfscipe*, which is only recorded in his texts (see below, I.21.4). He also seems to prefer members of the OE *dearf* word-field over members of the OE *dyrstig* word-field to render L *audax* and *ausus* when they have negative connotations (cp. DurRitGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 100.15 with DurRitGl 2 (Thomp-Lind)



179.17). The comparatively narrow meaning of the Norse-derived terms may have contributed to their selection either by themselves or as the first alternative in double glosses in the Aldredian work. However, given the semantic overlap between the members of the OE *dearf* and *dyrstig* word-fields, it is not surprising to find the Norse-derived adjective instead of (or next to, as in a very late text, viz. Ch 1110 (Harm 62); see below, II.15.2.14) the native OE *dyrstig* in the legal formula *ænig man sīe swā* [adjective] *þæt ...* ('no man shall be so presumptuous that ...').

Despite the initial association of the word-field with the Scandinavianized areas, OE *dearf* achieved a relatively wide distribution, as suggested by its presence not only in the *Life of Nicholas* but also in the early Middle English texts from the South-West Midlands analysed by Dance (Dance 2003). As noted above, 2.4.2.D, the Middle English reflex of OE *dearf*, like those of OE *efne* and *hyttan* (see below, 3.4.2.11.B and 3.4.2.13.C.2), seems to have different dialectal meanings: its original meaning, 'bold, daring, courageous', appears to have been retained mainly in the areas under the linguistic influence of the Scandinavian newcomers, while texts from other linguistic areas record from quite early on rather more negative meanings, viz. 'fierce, dreadful, cruel; difficult, hard', which probably developed by association with the reflexes of the native adjective OE *deorƿ* (see also the *EDD*: s.v. *derf*). These meanings are also attested in late Middle English texts from the areas where the Scandinavians settled down, possibly as a result of interdialectal linguistic contact. It is also interesting to note that some of the members of the word-field seem to have broadened their semantic range during the Middle English period, and are also recorded with positive connotations (see the *MED*: s.vv. *derf*, *derfli*), while the negativity generally associated with the word-field during the Old English period seems to have been maintained as far as other members are concerned (see the *MED*: s.vv. *derfnesse* and *derfshipe*; see further below, 4.2.5).

#### (A.2) TO PROSPER (OE *farnian*)

OE *farnian* is only recorded in the Aldredian glosses (see below, I.28), where it renders *L prosperare* 'to prosper, cause a thing to succeed'. Unfortunately, the lemma does not appear in any other of the texts glossed by Aldred nor does he use any of the native (near)synonyms mentioned by the *TOE* (08.01.01.03.08) meaning 'to prosper'. It is therefore very difficult to establish any semantic or stylistic relations between the Norse-derived verb and the other members of its lexico-semantic field. What is clear, though, is that the Norse-derived term is likely to have been a fairly peripheral member of its lexico-semantic field, as suggested by the fact that it is not otherwise attested in English texts.



**(B) ACTION****(B.1) COURSE OF ACTION, OPTION (OE *cost*)**

The Aldredian contexts where OE *cost* is recorded (see below, I.15.1.B) employ the term with the general meaning ‘way, manner’, always as a gloss for L *modus* ‘way, manner’. The *TOE* gives OE *endebyrdnes*, *gemet*, *weg*, *wīse*, and *gewuna* as alternatives to OE *cost* with this meaning (*TOE*: 11.05.02). However, of them only OE *wīse* could be considered to be (near)synonymous with the Norse-derived term in the Aldredian contexts, because OE *endebyrdnes* is clearly associated with order or sequential arrangement, OE *gemet* with measurement, and OE *gewuna* with habits and customary actions,<sup>96</sup> while OE *weg*, which is commonly used to render L *via* ‘road, path; method, manner’, refers primarily to a physical way or path, and this meaning also seems to be present when the term is used figuratively and the term refers to conduct (seen as a way of action).

As we might have expected from the previous comments, OE *wīse* is the only other term which Aldred used to render L *modus* meaning ‘way, manner’ (see below, 4.3.1); it appears in his glosses once by itself (LiPraefEuseb (Skeat) 18) and once as an alternative to OE *cost* (JnHeadGl (Li) 37). Given that Aldred presents the Norse-derived noun on two occasions without any further clarification, and that the two terms have similar frequency, it seems that he perceived them to be fairly equivalent with regard to meaning, register, and understandability.

In III *Æthelred* OE *cost* means ‘option’, and in this case it should be associated with OE *cyre*, *dōm*, and *wȳsc*, according to the *TOE* (07.01.01). However, from this list of suggested (near)synonyms, we could discount OE *dōm* because it mainly means ‘judgement’, either by an external authority, such as God, or by common sense. In the *Quadripartitus* we find OE *costas* rendered by L *optiones*. L *optio* is otherwise rendered by OE *cyre* (PrudGl 1 (Meritt) 587) and *wȳsc* (Bede 5 17.456.20; see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *wȳsch*). Of them, OE *cyre* is by far the commonest term and is recorded in legal texts; however, its specific legal meaning seems to have been ‘selection (of the oath-takers by the judge or adversary)’. Thus, the use of the Norse-derived term in the *Æthelredian* law-code may respond, not only to dialectal differences (see below, II.13.1.5), but also to an attempt to avoid confusion (see, however, the use of OE *cyre* in LawBlas 2).

<sup>96</sup> ME *cost* is recorded in the plural with the meaning ‘customary mode of behaviour, habits’ (*MED*: s.v. *cost*, n.1), but the Old English attestations do not allow us to see yet the association of the term with customary actions.

Notably, there seems to be a dialectal difference in the way in which OE *cost* is used in our corpus: while the Old English texts from the Scandinavianized areas record the term with the non-technical senses discussed in this section, those which cannot be easily associated with the Scandinavianized areas use it instead in its legal sense, viz. ‘condition’ (see above, 3.4.2.2.E.1).

### (B.2) FAULT, SIN, TRESPASS (OE *lēst*)

OE *lēst* is only recorded in a late homily based on Wulfstan’s and Ælfric’s texts, viz. HomS 30 (TristrApp 2; see below, I.53). It collocates with the verb OE *gebētan* ‘to correct, reform, amend’ in a sentence without any obvious source. Three native nouns appear in similar collocations in Old English texts: OE *gylt* (ÆHom 16 18 and 157, Conf 4 (Fowler) 18.76, LawAf 1 7.1, and LawNorthu 3), OE *synn* (ÆCHom I, 10 260.72, ÆCHom I, 17 (App) 539.121, ÆHom 14 169, HomS 40.3 (ScraggVerc 10) 131, and HomU 7 (ScraggVerc 22) 171), and, less frequently, OE *leahtor* (ÆLS (Ash Wed) 157 = ÆAdmon 2 19 = Conf 10.2 (CCCC 320) 24, and ThCap 1 (Sauer) 21.341.9). Of these four terms, OE *synn* seems to be the core member of the lexico-semantic field in the homilist’s idiolect, as it appears on four occasions in the text (albeit one of those uses, viz. HomS 30 (TristrApp 2) 4, is influenced by the wording in ÆCHom I, 18 317.3–4). None of the other terms meaning ‘fault, sin, trespass’ recorded by the *TOE* (16.02.01.13) is attested in the text. Yet the Norse-derived term, while somewhat peripheral in its lexico-semantic field, is well integrated enough into the homilist’s idiolect for him/her to feel happy to use it to replace the standard native nouns in a common collocation. This integration could also be associated with the common use of the term in some South-West Midlands texts from the early Middle English period (see the *MED*: s.v. *last*, n.3, and Dance 2003). The place of origin of HomS 30 (TristrApp 2) remains unclear, although the manuscript of the homily is likely to have a Worcester origin (see below, II.171), and, if the homily could be attributed a similar origin, the earliest attestations of the term might have been closely dialectally connected.

#### 3.4.2.11. Physical world and matter

As is the case with many other non-technical Norse-derived terms recorded during the Old English period, most of the terms belonging to this lexico-semantic field seem to be associated with the Scandinavians, their activities (OE *holm*), and the areas where they settled (OE *sōl* and *wæð*; see below) during the Old English period. (Things are not as clear as far as the OE *tacan* word-field is concerned, although, from a numerical perspective, most of its uses are

indeed associated with the Scandinavianized areas; see below.) The main and most puzzling exception is OE *loft*, which is only recorded in the Ælfrician corpus (see below, 1.56). The surprising occurrence of the term in this corpus has to do with the fact that Ælfric, who wrote relatively early (his texts are included in Group 3), did not originate from a Scandinavianized area and, as we might have expected, all the other Norse-derived terms recorded in the Ælfrician canon have a technical character (see above, 3.3.3). Whatever the relationship of the term with Ælfric's idiolect may be, it is certainly the case that the term seems to have a relatively widespread use by the thirteenth century (see the *MED*: s.v. *loft*, particularly sense 2, and Dance 2003: 367) and, thus, Ælfric's use may just be an early hint to this (see below, 4.2.2). Hug (Hug 1987: 353) attributes the fast expansion of the term to its formal and semantic similarity with OE *lyft* (see also Di Sciacca 2012: 176–85).

## (A) PHYSICAL WORLD

### (A.1) SMALL ISLAND IN A RIVER (OE *holm*)

As noted above, 2.4.1.C, the only attestation of OE *holm* with the meaning under consideration here may have been triggered by the use of this term in a document originating from Cnut's Anglo-Scandinavian court. Thus, its selection instead of any of the native terms which could mean 'island' or, in particular, 'small island', viz. OE *ēl* and the more common *īged* / *ēged* (see the *TOE*: 01.01.02.01.01.02; see also A. H. Smith 1970: s.vv. *\*ēl'* and *ēged*), may be due to the presence of the term in the original source used by the chronicler rather than to a semantic or stylistic factor. Neither native term appears in the section of the E-version of the *Chronicle* the annal 1025 belongs to (see below, II.163.19); therefore, it is difficult to establish any relationships between the three terms as far as this section of the *Chronicle* is concerned.

Later reflexes of the noun might not have been as strongly marked from a dialectal or ethnic perspective: even though the use of OE *holm* and its Middle English reflex as a place-name formative is associated with the areas settled by the Scandinavians (see A. H. Smith 1970: s.v. *holmr*, *holmi*, and Townend 2002: 118), Dance (Dance 2003: 424) argues in favour of analysing the Middle English reflex of OE *holm* in Lazamon's *Brut* as Norse-derived rather than as a semantic extension of the native meaning of the term, as Hug (Hug 1987: 259) would interpret it.

### (A.2) SUNDIAL (OE *sōlmerca*)

OE *sōlmerca* is likely to have been a very peripheral member of its lexico-semantic field, the core member seemingly being OE *dæg mæl*, which renders

L *horologium* ‘sundial; water-clock’ (ÆGl 321.5 = AntGl 2 (Kindschi) 739)<sup>97</sup> and, together with OE *pīl* ‘spike, nail’, L *gnomon* ‘pin or style of a sundial’ (ÆGl 321.5–6 = AntGl 2 (Kindschi) 740). OE *sōlmerca* is only attested in the Kirkdale inscribed sundial (viz. Inscr 22 (Ok 64); see below, I.81), which Judith Jesch has recently associated with two other eleventh-century sundials from Yorkshire with dedication inscriptions (viz. Aldborough, i.e. Inscr 1 (Ok 1), and Old Byland, where Haigh read ‘+SVMARLEÐAN HVSCARL ME FECIT’ (‘Sumarleði’s huscarl made me’) in 1879, although the inscription is nowadays almost illegible).<sup>98</sup> Given the rarity of inscribed sundials (see further J. Wall 1997), Jesch (Jesch 2009) argues that these sundials, with inscriptions in either Latin or Old English with some Old Norse influences (cp. the sundial in Skelton-in-Cleveland, historically also in Yorkshire, inscribed with Anglo-Saxon capitals and Norse runes), should be understood as a type of text particularly associated with the local Anglo-Scandinavian inhabitants. The latter would have adopted already existing cultural practices to create a new means of expressing their different cultural identity. In Jesch’s words, through these documents, as through non-inscribed Anglo-Scandinavian sculpture in Northern England mixing Christian and pagan motifs (e.g. the Gosforth Cross in Cumberland; see further Kopár 2013), the local inhabitants were trying to say ‘we are still Scandinavians; we have chosen to become Christians, but we are doing it in our own way, which is not quite the same way as you have done it’. Whether this is indeed the message that these documents were intended to transmit is of course difficult to know, but it does seem to be the case that the inscribed sundials are representative of a mixed culture and a mixed language and, therefore, the selection of OE *sōlmerca* rather than OE *dæg mæl* can be taken as indicative of that mixture and not as a result of clear semantic differences between the terms.

**(B) MATTER: MATERIAL, STUFF (OE *efne*)**

In its only attestation in the *OEC* (viz. DurRitGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 116.21), OE *efne* renders L *materia* ‘material, stuff’, a term which is more commonly rendered by OE *antimber* (see e.g. ClGl 1 (Stryker) 4081 and ÆGram 82.18) and *andweorc* (see e.g. LibSc 30.19 and AldV 1 (Goossens) 1503 = AldV 13.1 (Nap) 1484). Unfortunately, L *materia* does not appear again in the texts glossed by

<sup>97</sup> L *horologium* is likely to be the term represented by ‘ORLOGI’ on the tenth- to eleventh-century Great Edstone sundial (North-Riding Yorkshire) and it may also be the term represented by ‘OR[....]VM’ on the Opington sundial (Kent; see Okasha 1971: nos 41 and 99).

<sup>98</sup> I am very thankful to Prof. Judith Jesch for having provided me with a written copy of her 2009 paper.

Aldred, nor does he use in his glosses any of the native terms which the *TOE* records as meaning ‘material, matter, substance’ (*TOE*: 03). Therefore, it is difficult to establish any semantic or stylistic relationships between the Norse-derived terms and its (near)synonyms as far as Aldred’s idiolect is concerned. What seems clear is that the Norse-derived term seems to have been a fairly peripheral member of its lexico-semantic field(s) and that this noun should be associated with the other terms referring to everyday issues which are recorded in the Aldredian glosses; it points with them towards the establishment of close communicative ties between the speakers of Old English and Old Norse (see further below, 4.2.3).

As noted above, 2.4.2.F, during the Middle English period the uses of the term are not restricted to the areas settled by the Scandinavian newcomers. However, as in the case of the later reflexes of OE *dearf* and *hyttan* (see above, 3.4.2.10.A.1, and below, 3.4.2.13.C.2, respectively), there seems to be a difference in its use between the Scandinavianized and non-Scandinavianized areas: whereas texts from the former record the noun with the same meaning as the Aldredian glosses, the texts from the non-Scandinavianized areas record it rather with the meanings ‘nature, kind, character; ability, resources, means; occasion, cause’ (see the *MED*: s.v. *ēvene*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *evene*).

### 3.4.2.12. Possession and property

The Norse-derived terms in this lexico-semantic field can be divided into two groups according to various features:

- (1) terms whose Norse derivation is fairly certain and whose use is already somewhat widespread during the Old English period (particularly in one case): OE *gærsum(a)*, which is especially favoured by the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, and the OE *tacan* word-field (if we include the use of OE *oftacan* and *tacan on* in the *Life of St Nicholas*, a text of unknown origin; see above, 3.4.2.8.D, and below, 3.4.2.13.C.3);
- (2) terms whose Norse derivation is slightly more problematic and whose use is fairly limited during the Old English period (a feature which is itself presented as the main reason for their attribution of a Norse origin): OE *gēatan* (see above, 2.4.2.K) and *sadolfæt* (see above, 2.4.2.G).

(A) TRANSFERRING PROPERTY OR OWNERSHIP: TO GRANT (OE *gēatan*) and TO TAKE (OE *tacan* (*wið*))

The *OEC* records two Norse-derived terms which can be seen as converses, viz. OE *gēatan*, which, besides ‘to confirm, affirm’ (see above, 3.4.2.2.E.3),

means ‘to grant, bestow’, and OE *tacan*, which can be used to express the meanings ‘to take’ or ‘to receive’. As noted above, 2.4.2.K, OE *gēatan* is only recorded in the *Peterborough Chronicle*, most likely solely in connection with the linguistic characteristics of the markedly Scandinavianized Interpolations and the First Continuation. The term is presented as somehow equivalent to OE *giefan*, with which it is coordinated on a couple of occasions (viz. ChronE (Irvine) 675.46 and 693.23), probably because of the alliterative character of the combination. Interestingly, out of the verbs which the *TOE* (15.01.02) presents as meaning ‘to confirm, assign, bestow (property, land)’, the Norse-derived term is clearly the most common which may, again, point towards a preference for the term in the idiolect(s) or dialect of the person/people responsible for the entries (see above, 3.4.2.2.E.3).

With regard to OE *tacan*, we can see a change in the organization of the lexico-semantic field from a chronological rather than a dialectal perspective: the Middle English reflex of OE *tacan* eventually replaced the reflex of OE *niman* ‘to take’ and became the core member of the lexico-semantic field (see Rynell 1948). During the Old English period the Norse-derived verb is only attested in very late texts, mainly from the Scandinavianized areas (see above, 3.3.6), where it alternates with the native synonym, sometimes in the same context: e.g. ‘se kyng nam heora scypa & wæpna & manega sceattas, & þa menn ealle he toc’ (ChronD (Cubbin) 1072.11–13; ‘the king took their ships and weapons and many monies, and seized all the men’, as translated by Swanton 2000: 208). The alternation between the loan-word and its native (near)synonyms can also be seen in different versions of the same text. Notably, the E-version of the set of northern annals referred to here as ChronNor2 uses the native (near)synonyms of the loan-word in all the cases where the D-version includes the Norse-derived term, except, obviously, where it leaves the information out. Given that the Norse-derived term appears in the First Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, it may be that these lexical differences suggest that the loan-word was still perceived as dialectally marked (see further below, 4.2.1). Even if that is the case, Middle English texts show us that its use soon spread to other dialectal areas (see Rynell 1948: 348–56, the *MED*: s.v. *tāken*, and Dance 2003).

It is interesting to find the Norse-derived verb overlapping with its native counterpart not only as far as their core meaning is concerned, but also in connection with the peripheral meaning ‘to receive’, which OE (*ge*)*niman* could express by itself (see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.vv. *ge-niman* and *niman*), but which OE *tacan* expresses, as far as the *OEC* is concerned, only in the Norse-derived phrasal structure OE *tacan wið* (ChronE (Irvine) 1127.17). During the Middle English period, though, the loan-word could express this meaning by



itself (see the *MED*: s.v. *tāken*), which can be taken as an indication of the loan-word's assimilation to and eventual displacement of the native term.<sup>99</sup>

## (B) GOODS

### (B.1) PRECIOUS OBJECT, TREASURE (OE *gersum(a)*)

That OE *gersum(a)* had the non-technical meaning 'precious object' or 'valuable possession' is clearly suggested by the fact that it is used in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065.11 as equivalent to 'ealle his wæpna [...] 7 gold 7 seolfer 7 ealle his sceatas' ('all his weapons [...] and gold and silver and all his monies') in ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.14–15 = ChronE (Irvine) 1064.3–4 (cf. above, 3.4.2.2.E.3). Old English texts record a large number of terms with a similar meaning (see the *TOE*: 15.01.03), but many of them are hapax legomena, poetic terms (e.g. OE *æhtwela*), or terms that are restricted to religious texts (e.g. OE *woruldspēd*). Given that the attestations of OE *gersum(a)* in Old English texts are restricted to the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which records most of its occurrences, the related *Lives of St Giles* and *St Nicholas*, and one legal document (see below, I.35; see also IV.2.1.G), the terms that seem to be closest in meaning and register to the loan-word are OE *māðm* (e.g. ChronD (Cubbin) 1055.14 and LS 9 (Giles) 509) and *wela* (e.g. ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065.33 and 47 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.45 and 54, and LS 29 (Nicholas) 53), as well as phrasal expressions such as OE *dýrwurðe ðing* 'precious things' (ChronE (Irvine) 1086.150).<sup>100</sup> It is noteworthy that the *Lives of St Giles* and *St Nicholas* have similar lexical choices to the *Chronicle*, and indeed, it may be the case that the increasing popularity of the loan-word in annalistic writing contributed to its use in non-annalistic texts (even though ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1035 may be the first annal to record this term, it soon appears to have become one of the chroniclers' favourite terms).

<sup>99</sup> On the relationship between the OE *tacan* word-field and semantically related terms in the *Life of St Nicholas*, which records OE *tacan on* and *oftacan*, see below, 3.4.2.13.C.3.

<sup>100</sup> Although OE *sceatt* is commonly translated as 'property, goods, wealth, treasure' (see, for instance, Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *sceatt*, and Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *sceatt*), the chroniclers seem to have treated the term rather as a hyponym of the loan-word, as suggested by the entries in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065 and ChronD (Cubbin) 1065 = ChronE (Irvine) 1064 (see above), and the following wording in ChronE (Irvine) 1070.27–28: 'Hi namen þære swa mycele gold & seolfe & swa manege gersumas on sceat & on scrud & on bokes swa man ne mæi oðer tællen' ('they took there so much gold and silver and so many treasures in money, in clothing and in books that no man can tell another').



One of the reasons for the quick spread in the use of the term might have been that most English territories would have been affected by the Scandinavians' taste for riches and precious objects and their willingness to take them away, by force if necessary. However, needless to say, this comment is highly speculative and impossible to substantiate. In any case, whatever the reason for its rapid increase in popularity in the *Chronicle*, it survived the Norman Conquest and continued to be recorded with its non-technical meaning until the end of the Middle English period, when it seems to have been finally ousted by the French loan-word *treasure* (see the *MED*: s.v. *gersume*, n., and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *ger-sum*; cp. Dance 2011: 97–98 and 116–19).

### (B.2) TRAPPINGS (OE *sadolfæt*)

As noted above, 2.4.2.G, the meaning of the hapax legomenon OE *sadolfæt* is not clear, although it is likely to be 'trappings'. The *TOE* (04.02.05.06.05.03) does indeed accept that meaning and lists OE *gebæte(l)*, *gearwe*, *geræde*, *sadolgearwe*, and *sēam* as its (near)synonyms. Of them, though, we should only focus on OE *geræde*, *sadolgearwe*, and *sēam* because OE *gebæte(l)* seems to have referred instead to the harness, and OE *gearwe*, as a simplex, refers to clothing or vestments in general, not to trappings in particular (see the *DOE*: s.vv. *gebæte*, *gebætel*, and *gearwe*, noun<sup>1</sup>). OE *sēam*, though, is also somewhat problematic because, in the only context recorded by Bosworth and Toller and by Toller which could be associated with the Norse-derived term under consideration, viz. Gen 31.34, the Old English term renders L *stramenta* (cp. L *stramentum* 'covering, rug'), which has a wider meaning than 'trappings' (Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *seam*, sense II; Toller 1921: s.v. *seam*).

It is not easy to know why the author of Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) used OE *sadolfæt* instead of a native equivalent, but it may be the case that there existed significant familiarity with OE *sadol*-compounds in its area of composition. Indeed, the only attestation of OE *sadolgearwe* is also recorded in an East Anglian text (viz. Ch 1537 (Whitelock 27); see above, 2.4.2.G). This familiarity may be attributable to the presence of Old Norse speakers in this area, for compounds with the Old Norse cognate (cp. OIc *sǫðull*) as the determinant seem to have been fairly common (although there are no attested direct models for the two Old English compounds mentioned here; see Cleasby and Vigfusson 1957: s.v. *söðull*), while Old English texts, other than the two compounds under discussion, only record the poetic OE *sadolbeorht* 'with ornamented saddle', the by-name OE *sadolhaca* 'saddle-hook' (see Tengvik 1938: 380), and two compounds whose use is restricted to glossaries, viz. OE *sadolboga* 'saddle-bow' and *sadolfell* id. This suggestion is, of course, highly speculative.

### 3.4.2.13. Social interaction

With the possible exceptions of OE *gestning* and *oftacan* (on OE *hyttan*, see below, 3.4.2.13.C.1–2), which, as far as Old English texts are concerned, are only recorded in the *Life of St Giles* and the *Life of St Nicholas*, a couple of texts of problematic dialectal origin (see below, II.226), the terms in this group are recorded in clear association with the Scandinavianized areas during the Old English period.

#### (A) LODGINGS (OE *gestning*)

The *TOE* records OE *andfeng*, *cumliðnes*, *gystliðnes*, and the Norse-derived *gestning* as the terms meaning ‘hospitality’ in Old English (*TOE*: 08.01.02.04). However, in its only occurrence in the *OEC*, the Norse-derived term seems to mean ‘lodgings’ instead, for OE *underfeng gestning* in LS 9 (Giles) 417 renders L *hospitatus est* (cp. L *hospitari* ‘to be a guest, lodge’) in *Vita Sancti Aegidii* (see the *DOE*: s.v. *gystning*, and Treharne 1997: 159). In that respect, the expression OE *underfōn gestning* ‘to take lodgings’ in the *Life of St Giles* can be seen as equivalent to OE *wician*, *gystian* (see the *DOE*: s.v. *gystian*), *herebeorgian*, and the phrasal expression OE *niman herebeorge* (on OE *herebeorg*, see below, III.4.HH). There are various Old English terms which refer to places where guests could stay: OE *cumena hūs*, *cumena wicung*, *gystarn*, *gysthūs*, etc. However, it is not common for the guest to be the subject of the sentence where one of these terms appears; it is much more common for the host to be the subject and for the guest to be the direct object: e.g. ‘ge me underfengon on eowerum gesthusum’ (lit. ‘you received me in your guest-chambers’; non-lit. ‘you lodged me’) in *ÆCHom* II, 7 65.148–49.

Interestingly, as far as Old English texts are concerned, OE *gestning*, *gystian*, and the members of the OE *herebeorg* word-field are only clearly recorded in contexts which translate L *hospitari* or a member of its lexico-semantic field.<sup>101</sup> This seems to suggest that Old English speakers somehow struggled to render the Latin verb and to keep as close to it as possible.<sup>102</sup> They resorted to various

<sup>101</sup> OE *gystian* is only recorded on two occasions in the *OEC*: once as a translation of a form of L *hospitari* (LibSc 47.8), and once in a very anomalous gloss as a translation of a form of L *exultare* ‘to exult, rejoice’ (PsGLC 62.8; see the *DOE*: s.v. *gystian*). OE *herebeorge niman* is only recorded in the *Life of St Giles* (LS 9 (Giles) 481), where it also translates L *hospitari*; cp. OE *herebeorgian*, which is recorded in ChronF (Baker) 1050, where it renders L *accipere hospitium* ‘to take lodgings’.

<sup>102</sup> Note that OE *wician* is also occasionally used to render the Latin verb, e.g. in *ÆColl* 225, but it is less obviously related to the Latin lemma; that is the same shortcoming of the members of the OE *herebeorg* word-field.

measures, including the coinage of a denominal verb which was a loan-translation of the Latin verb (viz. OE *gystian*) and the use of a Norse-derived noun whose root could also be closely connected with the root of the Latin verb (viz. L *hosp-*, cp. L *hospes* ‘guest; host’).

Despite its apparent rarity, the Norse-derived noun survived the Norman Conquest, and its reflex is widely attested in Middle English texts (see the *MED*: s.v. *gesteninge*). As noted above, 2.3.1.1.A, the etymological relationship between the Norse-derived noun and ME *gest(e)nen* is not clear; therefore, it is difficult to say whether the survival of the noun may have been facilitated by the existence of the related verb, or whether it was precisely the survival of the noun that facilitated the existence of the related verb.

#### (B) MESSENGER (OE *sandermann*)

From the terms which the *TOE* (09.06.02.01.06.01) gives as meaning ‘messenger’ in Old English (viz. OE *ārendraca*, *ārendsecg*, *ār*, *boda*, *fērend*, *forridel*, *sand*, and *spellboda*), the Norse-derived OE *sandermann* seems to have been closest with regard to meaning and register to OE *ārendraca*, *boda*, and *sand*, the only terms which are recorded in the *Chronicle*. OE *ārendraca* seems to have been the core member of the lexico-semantic field in the *Chronicle*, as suggested by the fact that it is recorded in annals from different places and dates (e.g. ChronA (Bately) 904.12 = ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 905.1.10 = ChronD (Cubbin) 905.11, and ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.23 = ChronE (Irvine) 1064.11), while OE *boda* is only recorded in an annal of unknown origin (viz. ChronE (Irvine) 1094.3; see below, II.163.21), and OE *sand* is only attested in an annal that may be associated with the annal recording OE *boda* (viz. ChronE (Irvine) 1095.57) and in an annal from the so-called Second Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle* (viz. ChronE (Irvine) 1135.21). This may suggest that, in the dialect of the author of the First Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, the members of the OE *sand* word-field were actually the core members of the lexico-semantic field, OE *sandermann* being attested twice in that Continuation (see I.74). Notably, the Norse-derived compound under consideration is also recorded in the *Ormulum*, which was written in the same general dialect area (i.e. East Midlands) one or two generations later. Generally speaking, the Middle English reflex of the term retained its dialectal association with the Scandinavianized areas (see the *MED*: s.v. *sōndes-man*).<sup>103</sup>

<sup>103</sup> On the dialectal relationship between the First and Second Continuations of the *Peterborough Chronicle* and the *Ormulum*, see, for instance, Phillips 1997 and Hogg 2004b: 475–76.

## (C) ENCOUNTERS

(C.1) TO COME UPON, MEET WITH (OE *hyttan*)

OE *hyttan* is attested in Old English texts with two different meanings: 'to come upon, meet', which is discussed in this section, and 'to hit, strike', on which see below, 3.4.2.13.C.2. The group of D-annals where OE *hyttan* is recorded with the more 'peaceful' meaning attests three other verbs or verbal phrases meaning 'to come upon, meet with', viz. OE *cuman ongēan* (ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.45 and 64), OE *cuman tōgēanes* (ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.44), and OE *gemētan* (ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.20). They all seem to be (near)synonyms of OE *hyttan* (cp. the *TOE*: 05.12.05.02.01 and 05.12.05.02.02), and, in fact, ChronE (Irvine) 1066.16 records OE *gemētan* instead of OE *hyttan* in ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.27. This may be taken as an indication that one of the features that distinguished the Norse-derived term from its native equivalents was its dialectally marked character (see below, 4.2.1).

(C.2) TO HIT, STRIKE (OE *hyttan*)

OE *hyttan* with the rather more 'violent' meaning 'to hit, strike' is only recorded as far as Old English texts are concerned in the *Life of St Giles*. It is difficult to know the semantic and stylistic relationships that this verb held with its (near)synonyms in the author's dialect/idiolect because, of the verbs listed in the *TOE* (05.06.09),<sup>104</sup> the two related *Lives* only include OE *bēatan* (LS 9 (Giles) 161), in a context referring to handclapping. However, given that the concept referred to by the verb is not very common in the texts, it may be the case that the Norse-derived verb was not a very peripheral member of the field in that variety. Indeed, that this verb had become a significant member of its lexico-semantic field in some late Old English varieties is hinted at by early Middle English texts (see below, 4.2.5). Interestingly, though, Middle English texts show a dialectal difference in the use of *hitten*: the more 'peaceful' meanings, 'to meet, encounter' and 'to make one's way, go' (cp. above, 3.4.2.13.C.1) are only recorded in texts from the areas directly influenced by the Scandinavians, while the texts which are not associated with the areas settled by the Scandinavian newcomers only use the term with the more violent meaning, i.e. 'to hit, strike' (*MED*: s.v. *hitten*). It is probably very imprudent, though, to see this difference as a sign of the different types of Anglo-Scandinavian interaction in the areas (see further below, 4.2.5).

<sup>104</sup> The *TOE* does not record this meaning of OE *hyttan*; it only lists it in connection with terms meaning 'to come upon, meet with' (see above, 3.4.2.13.C.1).

(C.3) TO CATCH UP WITH (OE *oftacan*)

Like OE *tacan on* (see above, 3.4.2.8.D), OE *oftacan* is only recorded, as far as the *OEC* is concerned, in the *Life of St Nicholas*, where, as in later texts, it means ‘to catch up with, overtake’ (see Rynell 1948: 46, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *oftake*).<sup>105</sup> Given that this meaning is not expressed again either in the *Life of St Nicholas* or in the *Life of St Giles*, it is difficult to know the semantic and stylistic relationships that the new-formation would have had with its native (near) synonyms in the author’s idiolect/dialect. All we can say is that, at the stage of composition of these texts, the term is likely to have been still a fairly peripheral member of the lexico-semantic field (on which see the *TOE*: 05.12.05.07), its position being contested from quite early on by another English new-formation, viz. ME *overtaken* (see the *MED*: s.vv. *oftāken*, and *overtāken*; see also below, 4.2.5).

(C.4) TO HAVE SEXUAL INTERCOURSE WITH, COMMIT FORNICATION (OE *se(o)r[d/ð]an*)

Although the *TOE* associates OE *se(o)r[d/ð]an* with verbs meaning ‘to force (someone to have sexual intercourse)’ (*TOE*: 12.08.08.01.01) and, therefore, includes it in the lexico-semantic field of rape in Old English, it is not clear at all that an element of force was included in the meaning of the term. As noted above, 2.4.2.R, in its only attestation in Old English texts it renders L *moechari* ‘to commit adultery’, and its biblical context (Mt 5. 27) has no reference to rape (see also below, I.80). Neither is the Norse etymon generally associated with forceful intercourse (see Cleasby and Vigfusson 1957: s.v. *serða*). It would seem therefore better to associate the verb instead with those meaning ‘to commit fornication’ or, more generally, ‘to have sexual intercourse with’ (see the *TOE*: 12.08.8.01.02.01).<sup>106</sup>

Aldred preferred to render the Latin verb with OE (*ge*)*syngian*, which was somewhat less descriptive because it could mean ‘to sin’ more generally. This verb renders L *moechari* in all its occurrences in Aldred’s corpus, in all cases but one (viz. MtGl (Li) 5.27) in a single gloss. Frank has suggested that Aldred’s use of the Norse-derived verb in MtGl (Li) 5.27 may respond to the fact that the

<sup>105</sup> Treharne 1997: 104 translates the term instead as ‘to embrace’, but that translation does not seem fully appropriate (cp. Lindström 2004: 70). The *Life of St Nicholas* and the *Life of St Giles* generally use OE *befōn* and *gefōn* to express the meaning ‘to embrace’ (e.g. LS 29 (Nicholas) 44, 193, and LS 9 (Giles) 155).

<sup>106</sup> On the lexical differences between consensual and non-consensual sexual intercourse in Anglo-Saxon England, see further Horner 2004.

practice of committing adultery was so rare among the northern English that he had to adopt a ‘dirty’ word from his Danish contemporaries to describe it (Frank 2007: 27). In her view, Aldred may have tried to give forbidden sexual activities a foreign or exotic flavour, according to which his lexical choice would be comparable to the use of Fr. *ménage à trois* in Present Day English.

Frank’s view may indeed be the case, but we could also suggest that OE *se(o)r[d/ð]an*, together with OE *brȳdhlōp* (on which see above, 3.4.2.2.E.2), may be a linguistic pointer of the process of social integration undertaken by the Scandinavian newcomers: while OE *se(o)r[d/ð]an* could easily be associated with an initial period of (sexual) interaction, which could have partially been based on force rather than agreement (see Jochens 2002: 134–35), the same cannot be said as far as OE *brȳdhlōp* is concerned. Aldred’s use of the Norse-derived term, then, may not respond to any attempt to distance himself and his audience from particular sexual practices; instead, his selection may simply reflect linguistic practices in his dialectal area (see further below, 4.2.3).

### 3.4.2.14. Temporal reference

The terms associated with this lexico-semantic field are all recorded in texts from the Scandinavianized areas during the Old English period (see above, 3.3.2, on the OE *ār* word-field). This is not surprising, given their non-technical character. The lifespan of the adjective OE *fyrre(r)* seems to have been fairly limited even in the Anglo-Scandinavian areas: the two attestations of the term are restricted to twelfth-century manuscripts (see below, II.163.18 and II.239), and neither the *MED* nor the *OED* 1989 record later reflexes. The adverb OE *ār* and its derivatives, on the other hand, had a longer lifespan, although they kept in the main their initial association with the dialectal areas heavily influenced by the linguistic practices of the Scandinavian newcomers (see the *MED*: s.vv. *ēr*, *ērli*).

#### (A) EARLIER, FIRST (OF TWO THINGS) (OE *fyrre(r)*)

The attestations of the Norse-derived adjective OE *fyrre(r)* are restricted to two texts likely to originate from the Scandinavianized areas, viz. Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8), where it is recorded in connection with the (seemingly) Scandinavian practice of having two funerary feasts instead of one (see above, 3.4.2.8.C), and in the First Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle* (see below, I.34). In Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8) the loan-word appears in correlation to OE *oðer* ‘second; other’, a context where it is otherwise common to find the native OE *forma* (e.g. *ÆCHom* I, 27 405.158–59, and *LawIIW* 1.3), while in



the E-annal it identifies the feast of St Peter referred to as the earlier one (i.e. the feast celebrated on 29 June; see further Rushforth 2008: 75). In this context, the borrowed adjective seems to be equivalent again to OE *forma* (cp. ByrM 1 (Baker/Lapidge) 2.1.119) and OE *ærra* (cp. Ch 1478 (Rob 115) 16–17). It is likely to be the case that OE *fyrre(r)* was simply perceived as a (near)synonym of the native terms, probably too dialectally marked to be used in texts outside the areas where the Scandinavians settled down.

### 3.4.3. Conclusion

The analysis of the relationship between most of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Old English texts and their native (near)synonyms presents us with snapshots of the different stages of the terms' integration into Old English. The two extremes are represented, on the one hand, by those words which are only recorded once and with an obvious connection with the areas settled by the Scandinavian newcomers, and, on the other hand, by those words which are relatively widespread and whose ethnographic or dialectal origins cannot be easily traced. Furthermore, while, as anticipated (see above, 3.4.1), most of them are just peripheral members of their immediate lexico-semantic field, some of them, viz. OE *eorl*, *grið*, and *lagu*, did become core members (see above, 3.4.2.6.A.4, 3.4.2.2.D, 3.4.2.2.E.2, and 3.4.2.2.A, respectively), and closely connected terms, such as OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah* (see above, 3.4.2.2.C.3), soon followed in their footsteps. The coreness of other terms seems to have been rather more restricted: for instance, OE *gersum(a)* gained its core position mainly in the annalistic technoelect, its uses being in the main restricted to the *Chronicle* (see above, 3.4.2.12.B.1); similarly, OE *sandermann* may have been a core member of its lexico-semantic field only in limited dialects (see above, 3.4.2.13.B; cp. OE *gēatan*, on which see above, 3.4.2.2.E.3 and 3.4.2.12.A). A reduced number of words gained their core position only during the Middle English period, viz. the reflexes of OE *cnif*, *gecrōcod*, *hūsbonða*, *rōt*, and *tacan* (see above, 3.4.2.1.A, 3.4.2.8.E.1, 3.4.2.6.B.1, 3.4.2.8.B, 3.4.2.12.A, respectively).

The study of the relationships between Norse-derived and native terms has also given us some hints in connection with the reasons that may have led to the use, popularization, or eventual loss of particular terms:

- (1) Various reasons for the selection of specific terms in specific texts have been identified: the members of the OE *scinn* word-field might have been included in their texts in an attempt to increase the impression of high value of the items they are associated with. The foreignness of the terms



might have given the items an air of exoticism and thus high value, which was particularly important in the specific contexts where the terms appear (see above, 3.4.2.1.B). Similar connotations of foreignness may have contributed to the selection of the OE *cnearr* word-field, OE *se(o)r[ð/d]an*, OE *hūsting* in the *Chronicle*, and OE *dreng* in the *Battle of Maldon*, although this is not beyond doubt (see above, 3.4.2.5.A, 3.4.2.13.C.4, 3.4.2.2.C.4, and 3.4.2.3.B, respectively). Other terms seem to have been chosen rather because of the echoic effects that they contribute to develop (e.g. OE *carlfugol*, *ceallian*, *cwenfugol*, and *unsac*; see above, 3.4.2.8.A.1, 3.4.2.7.A, and 3.4.2.2.C.1; cp. OE *grið* in Mald 35; see below, 4.2.4).<sup>107</sup> The presence of OE *gestning* could be explained as a result of the shortcomings of its native (near)synonyms when rendering L *hospitari* (see above, 3.4.2.13.A). These various reasons should be associated with other factors that could have contributed to the selection of a particular term discussed in previous chapters, such as heavy reliance on information originating from the Scandinavianized royal household (see 2.4.1.C).

- (2) The increasing popularity of some of the Norse-derived terms recorded during the Old English period could be associated with the semantic specialization that they allowed for (e.g. OE *ærfle*, *dearf*, *fēolaga*, *hūsbonða*, *gærsum(a)*, *hāmsōcn*, *rān*, *toft*, and, possibly, *grið*; see 3.4.2.8.C, 3.4.2.10.A.1, 3.4.2.2.E.2, 3.4.2.6.B.1, 3.4.2.2.E.3, 3.4.2.2.B, 3.4.2.9.C, and 3.4.2.2.D, respectively; cp. *drincelēan*, see above, 3.4.2.2.E.3), with an increased contact with the Scandinavians and their origins (OE *norren*; see above, 3.4.2.8.A.3), with royal policies (e.g. OE *eorl*, *marc*, and *ōra*; see above, 3.4.2.6.A.4, and 3.4.2.4.A), or with the lexical preferences of particularly influential people (e.g. the OE *grið*, *lagu*, and *ðræll(l)* word-fields; see above, 3.4.2.2.D, 3.4.2.2.A, and 3.4.2.6.A.1).
- (3) Despite the fact that some Norse-derived terms did make their way into Old English texts, their exclusive association with the Scandinavian culture, which did not always match up with the way things worked in Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Scandinavian settings, seems to have been the reason for their early disappearance from the language (e.g. OE *hold* and *lȳsing*; see above, 3.4.2.6.A.4 and 3.4.2.6.A.2, respectively). A similar mismatch, in this case, a purely linguistic one, may have contributed to the disappearance of OE *taperex* (see above, 3.4.2.3.C).

<sup>107</sup> See further Pons-Sanz 2007b: 221 and 226–27 on the role which stylistic effects are likely to have had in the selection of particular Norse-derived terms in Wulfstanian compositions.

Finally, the analysis of the meanings of the Norse-derived terms in Old and Middle English has also revealed some dialectal differences between the Scandinavianized and non-Scandinavianized areas. For instance, OE *cost* means 'condition' in texts not associated with the Scandinavianized areas, whereas when it occurs in texts associated with the areas settled by the Scandinavian newcomers, it has instead non-technical meanings, viz. 'way, manner' and 'option' (see above, 3.4.2.2.E.1 and 3.4.2.10.B.1). OE *hyttan* is attested in a text probably originating from an area under Scandinavian influence with the meaning 'to meet up with, to come upon', whereas a text of unknown dialectal origin records it with the meaning 'to hit, strike'. Interestingly, during the Middle English period, the former meaning is in the main associated with the Scandinavianized areas, whereas texts composed in other dialectal areas tend to record only the rather more 'aggressive' meaning (see above, 3.4.2.13.C.1–2). The Middle English reflexes of the OE *dearf* word-field retain the meanings attested during the Old English period (viz. 'bold, daring', etc.) in the Scandinavianized areas, whereas in the areas outside the influence of the Scandinavian newcomers the word-field is used instead to refer to cruelty or hardship, probably because of the association of these terms with the reflexes of the OE *deorf* word-field (see above, 3.4.2.10.A.1). It is difficult to ascertain the reasons for these semantic disparities, although it is possible to speculate. It seems tempting to associate the semantic difference exhibited by OE *cost* with the predominance of technical rather than everyday Norse-derived terms in the non-Scandinavianized areas, while the dialectal differences exhibited by the Middle English reflexes of the OE *dearf* word-field might be attributable to a lesser degree of familiarity with the (original meaning of) the members of the word-field (and hence a higher tendency towards folk etymology) in the areas outside Scandinavian influence. It is harder, though, to explain the dialectal variation associated with ME *hitten*.

## THE NORSE-DERIVED TERMS IN THEIR TEXTS: SOME CASE STUDIES

### *4.1. Introduction*

Chapter 3 has analysed the Norse-derived terms recorded in Old English texts within their lexico-semantic fields and has tried to establish the level of adaptation of the terms in the Old English lexicon and their semantic and stylistic relationships with their native (near)synonyms. This analysis has allowed us to identify on some occasions the reasons that may have led to the use of a term in a particular text, as well as the possible reasons for the popularization or disappearance of some terms. The present chapter also looks at the Norse-derived terms in context, albeit a different one. It focuses on particular texts, examines the Norse-derived terms used in them, and explores the kinds of information that we can draw from such an approach: what the texts can or cannot tell us about the terms, and what the terms can or cannot tell us about the texts and the sociolinguistic situation surrounding them.

Needless to say, due to spatial limitations not all the texts discussed in this book can be examined in detail. Thus, the sections below deal only with a small selection. Those interested in other texts/corpora can also read Pons-Sanz 2007b, particularly chapter 7, on what the Norse-derived vocabulary can tell us about Wulfstan's origin and the sociolinguistic situation of eleventh-century England.

## 4.2. Vocabulary and Dialect

### 4.2.1. ChronD (Cubbin) 1065–80 and ChronE (Irvine) 1064–80 (= ChronNor2)<sup>1</sup>

As noted below, II.163.17, ChronD (Cubbin) 1065–80 and ChronE (Irvine) 1064–80 seem to rely in the main on a series of annals composed in some northern locality which deal mainly with Scottish and northern affairs. The northern origin of the annals is suggested not only by their content but also by the significant number of Norse-derived terms recorded in them. The two versions share the following terms:<sup>2</sup> OE *eorl* (see below, I.26.1.6.S), *eorldōm* (see below, I.26.2.2.E), *gersum(a)* (see below, I.35.3.F), *grið* (see below, I.39.2.5.E), *griðian* (see below, I.39.4.3.D), *healdan* (see below, I.45.1.C), *hlēapan ūt* (see below, I.46.1.A), *lið* (see below, I.55.1.1.B), *norren* (see below, I.64.1.A), and *ūtlagian* (see below, I.54.28.3.B).

While it is true that the D- and E-versions share a large amount of information and Norse-derived terms, they also have important discrepancies. The main differences between the two sets of annals lie in the facts that the E-version tends to either leave out or summarize some information which is present in the D-version (mainly in connection with Scottish affairs) and that they sometimes disagree in their wording. These lexical differences might give us a clue about the dialectal distribution of some Norse-derived terms in Old English. It is notable that most of the terms shared by the two versions are either words which appear to have enjoyed wide popularity in late Old English or words which were widely familiar to Old English speakers in their form if not their meaning (viz. OE *healdan* and *hlēapan ūt*). Yet the terms discussed below which are present in the D- but not in the E-version have a very different character, as suggested by their limited attestations in (Old) English texts.

Unfortunately, we cannot use the F-version of the *Chronicle*, which tends to rely on the E-version (see below, II.163.22), to establish the origin of some of the lexical differences between the two versions under consideration here because the F-version ends with the 1058-annal and, therefore, does not extend as late as the annals which concern us here. However, given the character of the terms involved, some of the lexical differences between the D- and E-annals could be explained as examples of the common scribal behaviour known *trivi-*

<sup>1</sup> The analysis of these annals relies on Pons-Sanz 2010, where the information that various sections of the *Chronicle* might give us in connection with the processes of adoption, transmission, and adaptation of Norse-derived terms in Old English is studied in more detail.

<sup>2</sup> Stafford speculates about a connection of the annals with York (Stafford 2006: 211).

*alization*, i.e. ‘the process by which scribes substitute simpler words for more difficult or unusual ones’ (Moffat 1992: 812). Thus, it could be the case that the wording in the E-version was changed at some point between the original composition of the annals in northern England and their arrival at Peterborough in the early twelfth century from an unknown location, possibly Canterbury. The following are the most significant lexical differences between the two versions of the *Chronicle* for our purposes:

- (1) Instead of OE *hyttan*, which is only recorded as far as Old English texts are concerned in ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.27 and LS 9 (Giles) 291 (see below, 4.2.5 and I.52.1), ChronE (Irvine) 1066.16 has OE *gemētan*.
- (2) The E-version seems to avoid using the Norse-derived OE *tacan*, which is relatively uncommon in late Old English (see above, 3.4.2.12.A): while the Norse-derived term is recorded in ChronD (Cubbin) 1072.13, 1075.32, and 1076.26, ChronE (Irvine) 1071.11 has OE *ātēon* instead, and OE *niman* is recorded in ChronE (Irvine) 1074.4 and 1075.21. Given that the Norse-derived verb is attested in the First Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, we cannot easily attribute the presence of the native terms to the Peterborough stage in the process of transmission of the annals (see above, II.163.18).
- (3) ChronD (Cubbin) 1073.4 refers to the Forth, the river marking the boundary between England and Scotland (see Breeze 1992), with the Norse-derived OE *wæð*, while ChronE (Irvine) 1072.3 refers to it with the native OE *gewæd*; that OE *wæð* may have been the term originally used in the northern annals could be suggested by the connection of later reflexes of the term with the Scandinavianized areas (see above, 2.2.2.3.D), and by the fact that the Norse-derived term is a common place-name element in Northern England, particularly Yorkshire and Cumbria (see A. H. Smith 1970: s.v. *vað*, and Sandred 1997: 205; cp. the *EDD*: s.v. *wath*, and Thorson 1936: 52).
- (4) ChronE (Irvine) 1075.11 has OE *yldast* in the same context where ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.11 records the only attestation in English texts of the Norse-derived noun OE *hofding*. The native term has caused some suspicion amongst scholars because it seems to be used in a slightly unusual way, which may indicate that someone was trying to avoid the use of the foreign noun (see below, note 44 in Appendix III).

These lexical differences may indicate that the D-version records the terms originally used in the northern annals and that these terms may have seemed too dia-

lectally marked to be fully acceptable for scribes outside the Scandinavianized areas. The character of the Norse-derived terms might have led those involved in the process of transmission of the annals to replace them with more familiar equivalents. The E-version does occasionally include Norse-derived terms which are not present in the D-version and which may have been included in the text before its arrival in Peterborough; however, the character of such terms is very different from that of the words discussed above:

- (1) ChronE (Irvine) 1069 summarizes some of the information presented in ChronD (Cubbin) 1068; as part of the revision undergone by the text, OE *sceatt* in ChronE (Irvine) 1069.9 replaces OE *gersum(a)* in ChronD (Cubbin) 1068.29, and OE *lið* is added in ChronE (Irvine) 1069.7.
- (2) ChronE (Irvine) 1074 reduces ChronD (Cubbin) 1075 drastically; it concentrates on the reception of Edgar the Ætheling at King William's court and ignores his two receptions at the Scottish King Malcolm's court. Various Norse-derived terms have been left out of the summarized version of the text (OE *gersum(a)*, *grāscinnen*, *grīð*, *hearmascinnen*, *lagian*, *scinn*, and *tacan* in ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.10, 11, 12, 14, 18, 24, 26, 27, 32, and 33), and OE *mid micclum weorðscipe underfōn* 'to receive with great honour', which appears in association with Edgar's reception at the two courts in ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.4–5 and 31–32, is replaced with OE *inlagian*. Notably, this verb is also recorded in the Latin annals compiled at Waverley Abbey, Surrey, in the thirteenth century (see Luard 1864–69: II, 192). These annals agree very closely with the E-version up to the point when the E-annals were transferred to Peterborough in the early twelfth century (see further, Plummer 1892–99: II, pp. lii–liii and lxiii, Howorth 1912: 313–18, and Irvine 2010: 51). Thus, the presence of the Norse-derived term in the Waverley Annals suggests that it is likely to have been included in the E-text before its arrival in Peterborough.
- (3) ChronE (Irvine) 1075, an annal that has undergone significant changes (see above and below), includes the expression 'heoldon ofer sæ to Flan-dran' (ChronE (Irvine) 1975.24–25; 'held their course over the sea to Flanders') instead of 'ferde ofer sæ' ('travelled over the sea') in ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.23 (cp. 'iverunt ultra mare in Flandriam' in the Waverley Annals; see Luard 1864–69: II, 193).

As suggested above, 3.4.2.2.A and 3.4.2.3.A, both the OE *lið* and *lagu* word-fields seem to have been fairly popular in the non-Scandinavianized areas during the late eleventh and early twelfth centuries. OE *healdan* with the Norse-derived meaning has a more limited attestation in Old English texts, but we

should not forget that it is also recorded in the *Abingdon Chronicle*, and that it may have been part of the nautical technoelect in south-east England (see above, 3.4.2.5.D).<sup>3</sup>

The comparison between the D- and E-annals which make up ChronNor2, then, may throw some light on the different levels of adaptation of various Norse-derived terms in Scandinavianized and non-Scandinavianized areas. It may even be the case that on one occasion they point towards different levels of adaptation between two Scandinavianized areas. Besides in connection to OE *hofding* and *healdan*, ChronD (Cubbin) 1076 and ChronE (Irvine) 1075 also differ as far as OE *brýðhlōp* is concerned: it is recorded in ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.39, but ChronE (Irvine) 1075.29 refers to the same wedding ceremony with OE *brýðdealu*. Given that the Norse-derived noun is otherwise only attested in a northern set of glosses (see above, 3.4.2.2.E.2), it may be the case that the D-version records the term originally used in the ChronNor2 annal and that the native compound in the E-version represents a later change. On the basis that the Norse-derived compound seems to have been a fairly uncommon term, this lexical difference could be associated with those discussed above which have been attributed to the process of transmission of the E-annals before their arrival in Peterborough. However, the replacement could also have taken place in Peterborough itself. This might be suggested by the fact that another lexical difference in the same context could point towards Peterborough as the place where this context underwent some alterations: while ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.38 explains that the Bretons who attended the wedding feast referred to were ‘fordemde’ (cp. OE *fordēman* ‘to sentence, convict, doom’), which is in keeping with L ‘judicati sunt’ (cp. L *judicare* ‘to judge’) in the Waverley Annals (see Luard 1864–69: II, 193), the E-version has ‘fordyde’ (cp. OE *fordōn* ‘to kill’) in ChronE (Irvine) 1075.29 instead. This may indicate different levels of familiarity with OE *brýðhlōp* in various Scandinavianized areas, thus highlighting even more its dialectally restricted character. However, we should not forget that it may actually be the case that the two examples of lexical replacement under consideration here should not be associated with each other, because, as suggested above, some differences between the annals (viz. OE *hofding* vs *ylldast* and *healdan* vs *fēran*) could be associated with a stage in the transmission of the E-annals previous to their arrival in Peterborough. While the number of

<sup>3</sup> Given that it is likely that OE *lið* in ChronE (Irvine) 1069, *inlagian* in ChronE (Irvine) 1074, and, probably, *healdan* in ChronE (Irvine) 1075 were not part of the original wording of the northern annals, they are associated in Chapter 3 and, hence, Appendix I with ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121.



attestations of OE *fordēman* and OE *fordōn* seems to suggest that the latter was more common than the former (the *DOE*: s.vv. *fordēman* and *fordōn* records approximately 125 and 300 occurrences, respectively), both verbs appear to have been fairly common and, therefore, it is not easy to identify this as another case of trivialization. The use of ‘fordyde’ for ‘fordemde’ may instead be a slip by the Peterborough scribe,<sup>4</sup> particularly given that s/he is known not to have been very accurate when copying his/her source (see below, note 44 in Appendix III). There are various reasons why such a copying error may have happened, e.g. some degree of illegibility of the term in the exemplar or the fact that, as noted by Aitchison, language users tend to pay attention mainly to the beginning and end of a word (she refers to this, somewhat jokingly, as ‘the bathtub effect’, Aitchison 2003: 138–40), and, indeed, ‘fordemde’ and ‘fordyde’ share the first and last syllables.

Whatever the actual origin of the use of OE *brýdealu* in ChronE (Irvine) 1075 may be, the annals included in ChronNor2 present us with a very interesting corpus for the study of Old English word geography. This is particularly useful given the limited number of extant Old English texts written in a linguistic variety other than late West Saxon (see, for instance, Hogg 1988 and J. Smith 1996: 17–19). It may seem somewhat puzzling, though, that a text that seems to have been compiled in Worcester, i.e. in an area which was not heavily affected by the settlement of Scandinavian newcomers in the late ninth century, records such a significant number of apparently dialectally marked and uncommon terms. Yet the presence of these terms in the D-version of the *Chronicle* may not seem so surprising if we consider a series of factors:

- (1) There appears to have been some Scandinavian presence in the eleventh-century South-West Midlands following Cnut’s conquest, and as a result of contact with powerful families from the Danelaw who expanded their holdings to non-Scandinavianized areas (see Dance 2003: 27–33, with references).
- (2) The religious houses in the area may have been particularly important places for the presence of Old Norse or, at least, Norse-derived terms: Worcester and York were held in plurality at least five times during the tenth and eleventh centuries, and the Benedictine house at Odense seems to have been founded by monks from Evesham (see Whitelock 1959, Whitelock 1965, and Dance 2003: 33–35; see also Tinti 2010: 65–66, and below, II.172).

<sup>4</sup> I am very thankful to Dr Kathryn Lowe for having pointed this out to me.

Notably, the Early Middle English texts from the South-West Midlands studied by Dance (Dance 2003) record many of the Norse-derived terms attested in the D-version, including the Middle English reflexes of OE *tacan* and *hyttan*. It could of course be the case that the *Chronicle* contributed to the popularization of the terms in the area, but the aforementioned factors are also likely to have had a bearing on the terms' acceptability in that dialectal area.

#### 4.2.2. Ælfric's Works

It is well known that Ælfric was particularly concerned with the grammar of his texts, to the extent that he carefully revised previous works, painstakingly correcting them (see, for instance, Sisam 1953: 181–85; see also R. Stephenson 2006 for a study of Ælfric's handling of his and others' Latin texts). His attitude towards vocabulary has received somewhat less attention. Yet we know that, while he followed with high consistency the so-called Winchester vocabulary (see Hofstetter 1988: 157), he did not slavishly attempt to keep to its choices. Indeed, Godden has shown that Ælfric seems to have had a more relaxed approach towards vocabulary than towards grammar: while his choice of terms clearly changed throughout his career, he hardly ever corrected the use of terms which had become obsolete in his idiolect. Godden (Godden 1980: 214–17) presents Ælfric as an author who was not afraid to innovate and alter his lexical practices, either for the sake of stylistic experimentation or because of external influences: e.g. he is likely to have adopted the use of OE *lagu* on the basis of its increasing popularity in the Old English legal technoelect and because of its dominant presence in the works of his near-contemporary Archbishop Wulfstan II of York. Similarly, rather than using his preferred OE *andwyrðan* 'to answer', he was happy to incorporate in his text on the story of St Gregory the Anglian (near)synonym *andswarian* because it is regularly used in one of his sources for this text (Godden 1980: 223). Furthermore, his selection of the non-Winchester noun OE *martyr* 'martyr' may have been the result of his awareness of the lack of familiarity with the Winchester term outside its area of dominance (Godden 1980: 222; cp. Gretsche 2001: 63).<sup>5</sup> The picture that emerges, then, is that of an author with clear lexical preferences but, at the same time, highly aware of contemporary alternative lexical practices. Accordingly,

<sup>5</sup> See also Hofstetter, who discusses other possible reasons for Ælfric's preference for OE *martyr*, such as the polysemous character of its native (near)synonym OE *cyðere* and the latter's lack of a fully developed word-field in connection with the martyrdom lexico-semantic field (Hofstetter 1987: 41–44).

Ælfric's lexical choices might give us an indication of the dialectal spread of Norse-derived terms which are not well-attested during the Old English period.

His texts record the following Norse-derived terms: OE *cnīf*, *lagu*, *loft*, *scegð-mann*, *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah*, *ūtlagian* (see above, 3.3.3). As noted above, the significant presence of the OE *lagu* word-field should not surprise us, on the basis of what we know about contemporary lexical practices as suggested by our extant records. Similarly, the extant Old English texts suggest that the OE *scegð* word-field and OE *cnīf* seem to have enjoyed some popularity in non-Scandinavianized areas during the late Old English period (see above, 3.4.2.1.A and 3.4.2.5.A–B). So far, then, his Norse-derived vocabulary is fully in keeping with what we may expect from someone whose origins lie outside the areas settled by the Scandinavian newcomers but who is familiar with the lexical changes affecting particular technolects. Yet Ælfric's use of the remaining Norse-derived term, viz. OE *loft*, is somewhat surprising, not only because this is the only non-technical Norse-derived term attested in his texts, but also because the extant Old English texts do not easily allow us to establish the term as being particularly common. The Middle English distribution of the noun, though, gives us a different picture, for it is well attested in Early Middle English texts from the West Midlands (see above, 3.4.2.11). Its presence in Ælfric's corpus could then be taken as a hint (admittedly, a very problematic one) of its possible widespread use in Old English.

Although as far as the *OEC* is concerned, the noun is only recorded in Ælfric's *Hexameron* (see below, I.56), it is worth pointing out that, as noted by Napier (Napier 1889: 278), the term is also recorded on fol. 89 of Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.15.34, a mid-eleventh-century manuscript which Ker (Ker 1990: no. 86) associates with Canterbury on the basis of the script and the illuminations, and which Assmann presents as having a close representation of Ælfric's language (Assmann 1889: 256; cp. Pope 1967–68: I, 77–80). In *ÆHomM* 5 (Ass 6) 170, Assmann corrected 'on lofte', the form in the only manuscript where the text is recorded, to 'on lyfte' (Assmann 1889: 256; cp. 'on lyfte' in *ÆIntSig* 18.103). Interestingly, the *Hexameron* and Ælfric's homily on the Gospel of St John, XVI.16–22, here referred to as *ÆHomM* 5 (Ass 6), are likely to have been composed within a short time span (see Pope 1967–68: I, 149). OE *lyft* might, then, represent one of the Ælfrician lexical experiments, a short-lived experiment possibly based on the unrecorded popularity of the term. In this respect, the term could be taken as a reminder of the fact that the extant Old English texts only appear to allow us to see the tip of the iceberg, particularly as far as the influence of Norse-derived vocabulary in non-technical lexico-semantic fields is concerned.

#### 4.2.3. Aldred's Glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and Owun's Glosses to the Rushworth Gospels

In a recent article on linguistic awareness during the Old English period, Stanley writes that, while it is clear that Aldred, the glossator of the Lindisfarne Gospels, came from a Scandinavianized area (see further below), 'there is little sign of that in the Old English glosses' (Stanley 2001: 243). A study of the Norse-derived vocabulary recorded in the glosses does not support that suggestion, though, because we find not only a handful of technical terms (viz. OE *brýðblōp*, *flēge*, *hold*, *ōra*, *saclēas*, *ðir*, and *ðræll(I)*), some of which appear to have had a particularly restricted dialectal and chronological distribution, but also a significant number of non-technical words (viz. the members of the OE *ār* and *dearf* word-fields, *cost*, *eggian*, *se(o)r[d/ð]an*, and *song*). We need to remember that the glosses were probably written *c.* 950, i.e. quite soon after the settlement of the Scandinavian newcomers in Anglo-Saxon England (see above, 1.3.1). In fact, if we compare the Norse-derived terms recorded in this text with those attested in (near)contemporary independent works, the glosses clearly stand out because all the other texts, both from Scandinavianized and non-Scandinavianized areas, record only technical terms (see above, 3.3.2). Therefore, we cannot easily disregard the terms recorded in the glosses, particularly because they may hint at a deep level of linguistic interaction between the speakers of Old English and Old Norse at quite an early date (cp. above, 3.2.1). We can of course not discount the possibility that at least some, if not all, of these terms, like the preposition OE *til* recorded in Old Northumbrian texts (cf. ME *til*, cp. OIc *til*; see below, IV.2.3.2.G), actually represent native reflexes of Proto-Germanic terms that, for whatever reason, have not survived more widely (cp. OE *afuhlic*; see below, III.3.2.A). The extant evidence for these terms, though, seems to point towards Norse derivation, and that is the line of argument followed in this section and in this book more generally.

Aldred carried on his work at Chester-le-Street, only a few miles away from Durham, i.e. in an area which, despite being outside the so-called 'Great Scandinavian Belt' (see above, 1.3.1), was in contact with the Scandinavian newcomers (see further Pons-Sanz 2000: chs 1 and 3, Hogg 2004a, and Kitson 2004: 232–33). Needless to say, we cannot know where exactly Aldred the glossator came from, but, as I have argued elsewhere (see Pons-Sanz 2004), the lexical data presented in these glosses can be said to be in keeping with what we would expect from an area with some, albeit not very heavy, Scandinavian presence, and accordingly, it seems appropriate to suggest that his place of origin is not likely to have been very far from his workplace.

Relying on the work of the Milroys on social ties as a means of language change transmission (see Milroy and Milroy 1985), we can suggest that the Old Norse speakers who settled in the periphery of heavily Scandinavianized territories are likely to have been forced to establish a significant number of strong and weak ties with Old English speakers quite early on, while the social life of those Old Norse speakers who settled in areas with a much more important Scandinavian presence might have been characterized instead, at least to start with, by the development of strong ties with other Old Norse speakers. The former situation would have encouraged much more the presence of Old Norse loans in Old English, and this is what the Aldredian glosses seem to reflect. This suggestion agrees with Björkman's hypothesis that the Scandinavians would have given up their idiosyncratic (linguistic or otherwise) characteristics earlier in the borderline areas than in the core areas of settlement (Björkman 1900–02: 6). Björkman's general point has received some attention in connection with the longevity of spoken Old Norse in England.<sup>6</sup> It has been supported by Samuels (Samuels 1989), who has argued quite convincingly (on the basis of the significant impact that Old Norse had on the local dialects) that the language of the Scandinavians is likely to have survived much longer in the areas of the 'Great Scandinavian Belt' than in other Scandinavianized areas, and by Watts's studies on northern Northumbrian place-names (V. Watts 1988–89 and V. Watts 1995), which led him to conclude that Old Norse died there earlier than in southern Northumbria, as indicated by the lower rate of retention of Old Norse inflections. Thus, the Norse-derived terms might offer us an insight, however problematic it might be, into the sociolinguistic situation surrounding the composition of the glosses.<sup>7</sup>

Aldred's glosses are closely associated with Owun's to the Rushworth Gospels (i.e. Rushworth 2; see further below, II.168). Traditionally, Aldred's and Owun's glosses have been taken as representatives of two dialectal subdivisions within late Northumbrian: given that Aldred worked around Durham, his work is taken as characteristic of Northern Northumbrian, while Owun, who worked at 'harawuda' (Name 4 (Ker) 2), is said to have left us an example of Southern Northumbrian on the basis that 'harawuda' is interpreted as Harewood in

<sup>6</sup> The issue of language shift by Old Norse speakers, though, remains somewhat problematic as it is difficult to know when Old Norse stopped being spoken in England (see Parsons 2001).

<sup>7</sup> Cp. Millar, who suggests that the demonstrative forms in the Lindisfarne glosses, which begin to show case and gender confusion, suggest a 'seepage up of originally low status usages, which may indicate familiarity with more recent, local linguistic trends' (Millar 2000: 61; cp. C. Jones 1987: chs 2 and 3, and above, 1.3.2).

Yorkshire. This view has been rejected by various scholars, though. Ross (Ross 1981) suggests that it was more likely to be the case that Rushworth 2 was composed in Chester-le-Street, where Farman, the author of the non-Northumbrian glosses to the Rushworth Gospels (viz. Rushworth 1) must have worked there too. Coates (Coates 1997) argues instead that ‘harawuda’ cannot be identified with modern-day Harewood and that Farman and Owun must have worked instead in Lichfield, where Owun, a priest from Chester-le-Street, must have taken the Lindisfarne Gospels towards the end of the tenth century at a time when the northern diocese was under attack by Scandinavian marauders. Although these scholars disagree about the place where the Rushworth Gospels received their glosses, they agree in suggesting that Owun was likely to originate from a very close dialectal area to Aldred’s, and this is also the conclusion reached by Hogg (Hogg 2004a) in a recent study on various phonological/spelling differences between the Lindisfarne glosses and Rushworth 2. In an article published in 2004 I analysed the Norse-derived terms in the two glosses from the traditional perspective; given that the latter may need revising and that the 2004 article differs from the present work as far as the acceptance of some Norse-derived terms is concerned, it seems appropriate to revisit the question here.

Of the Norse-derived terms recorded in the Lindisfarne glosses, we can leave out of the discussion OE *cost*, the *dearf* word-field, and *se(o)r[d/ð]an* because they only appear in passages that do not have correspondences in Rushworth 2 (see below, I.15.1.B, I.21.1.1.A, and I.80.1.A). If we focus on the loans which appear in the sections glossed by Owun, we can see that the Aldredian loans are recorded in Rushworth 2 when they are the only *interpretamentum* or the first *interpretamentum* in a double/multiple gloss. Thus, Owun’s glosses include the OE *ār* word-field,<sup>8</sup> *brȳdhlōp*, *flēge*, *hold*, *ōra*, *saclēas*, *ðīr*, and *ðræll(l)* (see below, I.3, I.8.1.A, I.31.1.A, I.48.2.A, I.66.1.1.C, I.72.1.A, I.89.1.A, and I.91.1.1.A). Owun might even be more confident in his use of OE *ōra* than Aldred: when rendering L *minas* (cp. L *mina* ‘Greek money of account’) in LkG1 (Li) 19.13, Aldred clarifies that the Norse loan-word is equivalent to L *libra* (‘tea ora *id est* libras’), which suggests that he might not have been fully sure that the term would be easily understood by others using the glosses.<sup>9</sup> Indeed, in the other

<sup>8</sup> Owun also includes members of the OE *ār* word-field in his glosses in contexts where Aldred has other terms: e.g. in LkG1 (Ru) 21.38 he renders L *manicare* ‘to come in the morning’ as OE *cuman ār*, while there is no equivalent for the verb in Aldred’s equivalent gloss (see below, I.3.1.1.A).

<sup>9</sup> This is somewhat problematic, though, because the Norse-derived term is recorded in Aldred’s colophon (Name 1.2 (HarmD 22)) in a way that suggests that this was a common unit



occurrences of the Latin lemma in the text (LkGl (Li) 19.16, 18, 20, 24, and 25), he prefers to render it with *L libra*, a term he trusts others will easily understand, despite the fact that it is not commonly used in Old English texts. Owun, on the other hand, not only leaves out the clarification in LkGl (Ru) 19.13, but also chooses the Norse-derived term instead of the Latin loan in LkGl (Ru) 19.16 as the only *interpretamentum* for *L minas* (see below, I.66.1.1.B).

As far as the Norse-derived loans which are not the first alternative in Aldred's double/multiple glosses are concerned, the situation is slightly different, though. These terms might be particularly important if we agree with Hines that 'alternative glosses placed in second place are unlikely to be less familiar to the reader [...] if anything, they should be more familiar, ensuring that the meaning is not missed or mistaken' (Hines 1991: 410–11). This suggestion, while reasonable, is difficult to prove, because it would require the daunting task of compiling frequency lists for the lexical items that appear in double/multiple glosses. In any case, the Norse-derived terms under consideration here are OE *eggian* and *song*. A study of the way in which Owun deals with Aldred's double/multiple glosses in the randomly selected Gospel according to St John indicates that his handling of OE *song* is widely in keeping with his common practice. He clearly preferred to simplify the Aldredian glosses by choosing only the first alternative, this being his practice in 53 per cent of the cases (see Pons-Sanz 2004: 185); this is precisely what he did in LkGl (Ru) 22.12, where OE *bedd* is the only *interpretamentum* for *L stratum*. Unfortunately, it is impossible to know how he reacted to OE *song* when this was the first alternative, as it is the case in MkGl (Li) 14.15, because this passage falls in a lacuna in Rushworth 2. More interesting, though, is his handling of OE *eggian*: this verb renders *L concitare* together with OE *weccan* in MkGl (Li) 15.11, but in the equivalent passage in Rushworth 2 OE *eggian* is replaced by OE *ciegdan* (see above, 3.4.2.7.B). The maintenance of Aldred's first alternative and the replacement of the second one is something that Owun only did once in the Gospel according to St John (see Pons-Sanz 2004: 184–85), which might suggest that his dislike of OE *eggian* was particularly strong. The reasons for this, though, are very difficult to establish, lack of familiarity with the term or a perception of the term as inappropriate (because of semantic or stylistic reasons) being only some of the possible factors leading to his behaviour. Alternatively, of course, it could

of account in the community, regardless of how problematic the colophon might otherwise be (see Nees 2003): we are told that he paid eight oras of silver to enter the community (see below, I.66.1.1.C). The identification of the specific audience that Aldred had in mind when writing the glosses remains very problematic, though (see Stanton 2002: 49–52).



also be the case that Owun's source might not have been the Lindisfarne glosses themselves and that OE *eggian* was not recorded in it (see below, II.168).

Unfortunately, the extant evidence does not allow us to support or reject with any conviction the suggestion that Owun might have originated from a close dialectal area to Aldred's. The material we have could be said to point towards a higher degree of familiarity with technical terms, because, as far as non-technical terms are concerned, his glosses only include the members of the OE *ār* word-field, and reject OE *eggian* and *song*. However, we should not jump to conclusions, because the picture painted by the glosses might have been different if there had not been a lacuna in MkGl (Li) 16.5 and if Owun had glossed the equivalent contexts where Aldred used the non-technical OE *cost*, the *dearf* word-field, and *se(o)r[d/ð]an*. As far as the Norse-derived terms in the glosses allow us to see, then, he could have originated from somewhere in Northern or Southern Northumbria.

#### 4.2.4. *The Battle of Maldon*<sup>10</sup>

The fact that the Norse-derived terms recorded in the poem might be useful to obtain information on various issues surrounding its composition has not passed unnoticed by scholars. Such terms have been interrogated, amongst other issues, in connection with the poem's date (see below), its possible literary connections (see Phillpotts 1929), and the author's literary skills (see Robinson 1993). The latter two areas of research will not be explored here, though; suffice it to say that the information provided by the terms is clearly problematic, and, therefore, it is impossible to reach firm conclusions (see Harris 1993, Carroll 2001: 42–44, and Pons-Sanz 2008: 439–41). This section will focus instead on the information that the Norse-derived terms can provide us with in connection with the dialectal origin of the poem; the discussion of that topic requires engaging as well with the possible date of composition of the text. Unfortunately, though, as the reader will soon discover, the evidence in this respect is similarly inconclusive.

Given that the date of composition of the poem plays a very significant role in the discussion of its dialectal origin, this aspect will be discussed first. The *terminus post quem* for its composition is clearly determined by the date of the battle the poem is based on; we know that Ealdorman Byrhtnoth and

<sup>10</sup> The content in this section relies on Pons-Sanz 2008; see the original article for an in-depth study of the Norse-derived terms in the poem.

his troops faced the Viking marauders in Maldon in 991, as recorded in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 991 = ChronD (Cubbin) 991 = ChronE (Irvine) 991 = ChronF (Baker) 991). However, we do not have a codicological *terminus ad quem* because the poem is only extant in a post-medieval copy. The debate regarding the date of the poem has revolved instead, at least partially, around the poem's use of OE *eorl* to refer to Byrhtnoth. On the basis that the term might be used as equivalent to OE *ealdormann*, a usage which is not otherwise very common until Cnut's reign (see above, 3.4.2.6.A.4),<sup>11</sup> McKinnell suggests that we should think of 'a date about or after 1020 rather than [...] the end of the tenth century' (McKinnell 1975: 132), and this suggestion has been echoed by various scholars interested in the poem (e.g. Robinson 1993: 129, and Blake 1978: 120). McKinnell's view, though, has been criticized from various angles. On the one hand, Clark (C. Clark 1983) has noted that already during Æthelred's reign Archbishop Wulfstan used the Norse-derived term to refer to people without any specific connection with the Scandinavianized areas. On the other hand, Scragg (Scragg 1981: 27) points out that, while OE *ealdormann* was the accepted title for Byrhtnoth in the late tenth century, the *Maldon*-poet may have attempted to exploit the poetic overtones of OE *eorl*, given its reference to a brave man of aristocratic descent. Taking the spelling <byrht> for the name of the ealdorman and other characters in the poem as the starting point, Scragg (Scragg 1981: 24) suggests instead that the poem is likely to date from the late tenth century, when that spelling was the norm (cf. <beorht> in the ninth century, and <briht> in the eleventh century; cp. Scragg 1993: 27–28). Still, given the difficulties involved in dating the poem with any precision, any discussion on its dialectal origin has to take these diverse dates into account.

As far as the localization of the poem is concerned, three main suggestions have been put forward:

- (1) Gordon believes that its language 'is in the main so consistently and characteristically West Saxon that it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the text is in some way connected with the south-west' (Gordon 1937: 38). This identification of the text as a West-Saxon product has been accepted, among others, by Lutz (Lutz 1984: 60) and Robinson (Robinson 1993: 126).
- (2) Scragg notes that, despite the consistency with which the poem conforms to the West-Saxon standard,

<sup>11</sup> However, the actual meaning of the term in the poem is a hotly debated topic; see Pons-Sanz 2008: 426–27, with references.

the poet's eulogizing of the men of Essex suggests that we look initially at that area for the genesis of the poem, and the few eastern spellings and Danish words that occur make eastern composition highly likely [...]. The contenders for a monastery in which the poem might have been recorded in the eastern counties are numerous; those which we know to have benefited from Byrhtnoth's generosity range from Ely in the north to Christ Church, Canterbury, and we have insufficient linguistic evidence on which to exclude any of them. (Scragg 1981: 28)

Although Scragg (Scragg 1981: 52–53 n. 132), like Phillpotts (Phillpotts 1929: 188), Clark (C. Clark 1983), and Gneuss (Gneuss 1996: 55–63), does not favour any eastern area, he highlights the linguistic similarities between the poem and a document from Christ Church, Canterbury, made a few years after 991, viz. Ch 939 (Whitelock 16.2), on which see above, 2.5.C, and below, II.13.1.2.<sup>12</sup> Griffith (Griffith 1998), like Laborde (Laborde 1936: 69–72 and 79), openly argues in favour of Essex or the south-east as the place of composition of the text on the grounds that the non-West-Saxon spellings (e.g. <gofol> in Mald 61; cf. WS <gafol>) seem to be concentrated in the speeches of the protagonists.<sup>13</sup> Griffith interprets this as an indication that

a poet from this area who generally used the conventional forms of the late West Saxon standard orthographic system deviated from the norms of good spelling (as he understood them) and was attracted (probably unconsciously) to non-standard local spellings when presenting the words of the people he knew to be, or had particular interest in representing as, local. (Griffith 1998: 273)

- (3) Hart's reappraisal (Hart 1992: ch. 3, and Hart 1993) of the Scandinavian presence in Essex indicates that the Scandinavians would have only succeeded in the northern and eastern corners in the 880s, but were probably driven out by the West-Saxons between 912 and 917 when Colchester was recaptured. His findings, like those previously presented by Clark (C. Clark 1983: 6), suggest that the Scandinavian influence on the area was not very significant. Thus, the poem might have been associated with an area further north than Essex, Ely being the front-runner in Hart's mind. Indeed, Fisiak's identification (Fisiak 2001: 26–33) of the confusion between <e>

<sup>12</sup> Scragg also points out that the two texts record Norse-derived vocabulary; however, it is very difficult to associate them from this perspective, because the legal text only records the legal term OE *cost* (see above, 3.4.2.2.E.1, and below, I.15.1.A).

<sup>13</sup> For a more detailed list of non-West-Saxon spellings, see Scragg 1981: 24–25.

and <y> during the eleventh century in areas stretching from East Anglia to Warwickshire and Shropshire rules out the only spelling among those described by Scragg (Scragg 1981: 24–25) as non-West Saxon that could have strongly argued in favour of a south-eastern origin.

It is within this uncertain attribution of the poem to places as distant as the south-west, the south-east, and East Anglia that the discussion on the association between its Norse-derived loans and its origin has to proceed.

Although a very large number of terms and structures in the poem have been attributed Norse derivation and influence (see below, Appendix III, and Pons-Sanz 2008: 422–39), only a handful of terms can be accepted to be Norse-derived with some confidence: OE *ceallian*, *dreng*, *eorl* (?),<sup>14</sup> and *grið*. All of them, except for OE *ceallian*, can be said to be technical terms, even if the exact meaning of OE *dreng* is not clear (see above, 3.4.2.3.B, and below). The low number of these terms and their character could be taken as an indication that the poem did not originate from a Scandinavianized area (cp. the Group 2 and 3 texts; see above, 3.3.2–3); however, the mixture of technical and non-technical terms and the use of a term associated with the lexico-semantic field of communication could make us think of the Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels (see above, 4.2.3), which are likely to be the product of a speaker from a peripheral area of Scandinavian settlement. The association between these texts would be particularly tempting if an earlier rather than a later date of composition for the poem is accepted. It is also important to remember that other issues, such as register and poetic expectations, are also likely to have influenced the poet's lexical choices (see below).

The dialectal distribution of the terms is not very helpful in order to ascertain the origin of the text either:

- (1) As noted above, 3.4.2.7.A, although OE *ceallian* is only recorded in the poem under consideration, its Middle English reflex is very soon attested in texts from the South-West Midlands. Whether this can be taken as a suggestion that the verb might have already been in use in that area at the time of composition of the poem or should instead be understood as a result of later interdialectal contact is, of course, difficult to tell.
- (2) The problems associated with how best to understand the meaning of OE *dreng* in the poem complicate the discussion of its dialectal distribution: as noted above, 3.4.2.3.B, an identification of the term as part of the lexico-

<sup>14</sup> This term should only be considered here if it is indeed used as equivalent to OE *ealdor-mann* (see above in this section).

semantic field of martial activities would, again, bring it close to an early Middle English text from the South-West Midlands (viz. *Lazamon's Brut*), while its inclusion in the lexico-semantic field of social status, i.e. as a reference to a freeman of low social status, would point instead towards the Scandinavianized areas.

- (3) As noted above, if OE *eorl* is indeed used as an equivalent of OE *ealdor-mann*, its use in a late tenth- or early eleventh-century text from a non-Scandinavianized area might not be too surprising given that the Wulfstanian corpus exhibits similar characteristics.
- (4) Other than in this poem, OE *grið* might be first recorded in the late tenth-century legal code known as *III Æthelred*, which is associated with the Danelaw Five Boroughs, but this apparent initial association of the term with the Scandinavianized areas seems to have died out very quickly, for the term plays a very significant role in the Wulfstanian canon (see above, 3.4.2.2.D). The alternation between OE *grið* and *frið* (see below) and their use with the meaning 'truce' rather than 'peace' or 'protection' associate the poem with the *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut* (see above, 3.4.2.2.E.2, and below, 4.3.2), a text of problematic origin (see below, II.163.6) with which the poem has already been compared on the basis of its narrative techniques and content (see Wilcox 1995).

As far as the selection of the Norse-derived terms is concerned, there are two main considerations to bear in mind:

- (1) Although it has been suggested that the Norse-derived terms in the poem might serve a purpose of characterizing the Viking marauders as *the other* (cp. OE *cnearr* in *The Battle of Brunanburh*; see above, 2.4.1.A), this suggestion cannot be easily accepted because, although OE *dreng* is clearly presented in connection with one of the attackers, OE *grið* is the only Norse-derived term in the speech of the Viking messenger, and OE *eorl* and *ceallian* appear in connection with Byrhtnoth, the most important representative of the Anglo-Saxon side (see further Pons-Sanz 2008).
- (2) All the terms, except one case of OE *eorl* (viz. Mald 159), appear in alliterative position, and they could be said to be the best alternative either because no other synonymous terms starting with the same sound exist or, if they do, they may not be particularly appropriate for the context. This seems to be the case as far as OE *grið* in Mald 35 is concerned, because it alternates with the native OE *frið* following the needs of alliteration (and probably not, as Robinson 1993 would have wanted it, in order to characterize the Viking messenger as a foreigner; cp. above, 3.4.2.7.A).

Thus, while the terms appear to have reached a significant level of integration in the dialect/idiolect of the poet, their use also seems to be stylistically constrained. Indeed, it is noteworthy that poetic texts are clearly a minority in the corpus of this study, and that could be the result of the fact that the lexical constraints of the poetic language might have been perceived to be stronger than those in prose and that poets felt that the incorporation of Norse-derived terms into their poetic lexical repertoire was only acceptable when very clear stylistic reasons were present or when the term was actually the best (or the only) lexical option because of its position in its lexico-semantic field (e.g. OE *lagu* in the Wulfstanian(sounding) ChronD (Cubbin) 959 = ChronE (Irvine) 959, and ChronD (Cubbin) 975, and, possibly, in the poem on the Judgement Day here referred to as JDay II, and OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah* in the Durham Hymnal gloss; see above, 3.4.2.2.A and 3.4.2.2.C.3, and below, II.257.1). The non-technical Norse-derived terms might have been perceived as non-traditional, too colloquial, etc.

The Norse-derived terms recorded in the poem, then, cannot help us to reject any of the places of composition that have been suggested for it:

- (1) An origin in the south-west or Kent, i.e. in areas with minimal Scandinavian influence, could be accepted especially if OE *ceallian* and *eorl*, the more problematic loans as far as their identification as Norse-derived is concerned and the terms which are not specifically used in connection with the attackers, are left out or, if they are not, if the poem is attributed a later rather than an earlier date.
- (2) An origin in the marginally Scandinavianized areas could be argued on the basis that the poem, like the Aldredian glosses, already includes a term referring to one of the most basic areas in life, personal communication, and that, as things stand, the Norse-derived terms do not give us any indication of being strongly associated with a foreign culture. This suggestion gains particular impetus if the poem is attributed an early date of composition (i.e. if it can be associated with the texts belonging to Group 2; see above, 3.3.2).
- (3) An origin in the more heavily Scandinavianized areas cannot be easily rejected either on the same principles as those outlined in the previous point, as well as the possible lexical constraints of poetry, a literary form that does not seem to have facilitated the incorporation of a large number of Norse-derived terms into the acceptable repertoire available to poets.

#### 4.2.5. The *Lives of St Nicholas and St Giles*

The dialectal origin of these two texts, which are likely to have been translated from their Latin originals after the Norman Conquest by a single person and which are recorded in a manuscript of Kentish provenance (see below, II.226), remains a contended issue. Their language is characteristically late West Saxon, with some deviations that could be attributed to the scribe rather than the author (see Ahern 1975: 24–32, Picard 1980: 33, and Treharne 1997: 61–78, with references). The identification of the dialectal origin of the initial translator has relied, then, to a great extent, on the cult of the saints and on the Norse-derived terms recorded in the texts. Given that the south-west, particularly Worcester, and the south-east appear to have been the two focal points of the saints' cult, these two areas have both been put forward as the likely place of translation: see Ahern (Ahern 1975: 3 and 37) for an argument in favour of the south-west, and Treharne (Treharne 1997: 78), who relies on Schipper's work (Schipper 1986), for a view in favour of the south-east. On the basis that the texts record a significant number of Norse-derived terms (but without going into any more detail), Hofstetter (Hofstetter 1987: 143–45 and 245) hypothesizes that they probably originate from an area in or around the Danelaw (cp. Picard 1980: 33). Given that the present author is not qualified to pass judgement on the evidence based on the cult of these two saints, that line of enquiry will be left aside and the rest of this section will be based instead on whether the Norse-derived terms recorded in the texts can indeed help us to decide between these suggested locations (i.e. an area around Worcester, Kent, Essex, or the Danelaw).

The texts record the following Norse-derived terms: OE *gecrōcod*, *dearflice*, *eorl*, *gærsum(a)*, *gestning*, *grið*, *hyttan*, *lagu*, *oftacan*, *rōt*, *tacan (on)*, and *ūtlaga / ūtlah*. Of them, given their wide dialectal distribution in late Old English, OE *eorl*, *gærsum(a)*, *grið*, and the members of the *lagu* word-field can be left out of the discussion. Rather than pointing towards a particular dialectal origin, these terms can be said to be indicative of the author's familiarity with the lexical developments in particular technolects. If we look at the remaining terms just in connection with (near)contemporary texts, the picture that they suggest seems to agree with Hofstetter's conclusion: the texts record terms which are otherwise associated with works originating from the Scandinavianized areas (viz. OE *dearflice* and the *tacan* word-field) as well as non-technical terms which are not recorded in other Old English texts (viz. OE *gecrōcod*, *gestning*, and *rōt*).<sup>15</sup> Given that the texts belong to the transition between the Old and

<sup>15</sup> Notably, though, the author of the saints' lives was happy to use the OE *tacan* word-field



Early Middle English periods, though, it is important to consider as well the hints provided by later texts. Interestingly, while less strongly than the Old English data, the Middle English evidence may also point towards an area in or close to the Danelaw. The strongest indication in this direction comes from OE *dearflice* and *tacan on*: the members of the ME *derf* word-field are recorded with the same positive overtones as in the hagiographic text almost exclusively in works originating from the areas of settlement of the Scandinavian newcomers (cp. above, 3.4.2.10.A.1). Similarly, ME *tāken* meaning ‘to touch’ is recorded in texts from the Danelaw and Kent (see *MED*: s.v. *tāken*, sense 1b). The main argument against this association with the Danelaw may come from OE *oftacan*, the early Middle English reflex of which being mainly associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas, particularly the West Midlands (see *MED*: s.v. *oftāken*, sense 1; cp. Rynell 1948: 348–56).<sup>16</sup> The Middle English attestations of the reflexes of OE *gecƿōcod*, *gestning*, *hyttan*, and *rōt* do not clearly point in any direction. (While ME *hitten* is attested with its more ‘peaceful’ meaning almost exclusively in texts associated with the Danelaw, the same cannot be said about the more ‘violent’ meaning ‘to hit, strike’, which is widely used in Middle English texts from various dialectal areas; see above, 3.4.2.13.C.1–2.)

In conclusion, the extant evidence seems to support an association of the texts with the Scandinavianized areas; however, given that particularly strong evidence is lacking, it seems more appropriate to analyse these works in connection with those of unknown origin, although the hints provided by the Norse-derived terms should also be borne in mind.

to express meanings not covered by the closest (near)synonym of the verb: viz. ‘to touch’ (OE *tacan on*) and ‘to catch up with’ (OE *oftacan*) (see above, 3.4.2.8.D and 3.4.2.13.C.3). Yet neither text records a member of the word-field (the simplex OE *tacan* being the expected choice) to express the meanings covered by OE *niman*, i.e. ‘to take’ and ‘to receive’. Instead, OE *niman* and members of the OE *tēon* word-field are frequently used to express the meaning ‘to take’ (e.g. LS 29 (Nicholas) 87, 229, 462, and LS 9 (Giles) 226, 374, 480, etc.); ‘to receive’, on the other hand, is frequently expressed by OE *underfōn* (e.g. LS 29 (Nicholas) 164, 165, 170, 178, and LS 9 (Giles) 138, 169, etc.).

<sup>16</sup> Interestingly, for instance, the version of the Middle English romance *King Horn* recorded in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 108 has this verb in the same context as the version recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Gg.4.27. While the former manuscript has connections with Oxfordshire (see Görlach 1974: 89), the latter has been localized in Berkshire (see the *MED*: s.v. *oftāken*, sense 1).

### 4.3. *Vocabulary and Authorship*

Establishing the identity of the author of a particular Old English text is often notoriously difficult because specific attributions are very rare and stylistic tests are not fully reliable given that they take into account issues of authority, and that creates a vicious circle that is very difficult to break. Furthermore, and in close connection with the previous factor, we know that the concept of authorship during the Old English period was very different from our own, for imitators felt no qualms about taking entire fragments from their sources, and that complicates attributions even further (cp. Pons-Sanz 2007b: ch. 1, and Pons-Sanz 2007c). This, however, has not discouraged Old English scholars from trying to make authorial attributions on the basis of the vocabulary of a text, and, indeed, there have been some very successful results, such as the identification of the Old English Orosius as a non-Alfredian text (see Bately 1970, Bately 1982, and Liggins 1970), or the division of the Old English Pentateuch into Ælfrician and non-Ælfrician parts (see Jost 1927 and Clemoes 1974a).

Within this context, the presence or absence of particular Norse-derived terms can also be helpful in establishing the authorship of a text. For instance, as I have pointed out elsewhere (Pons-Sanz 2007b: 154–55), an analysis of the OE *grið* and *frið* word-fields in the legal tract known as the *Northumbrian Grið* (*Nor. Grið*) suggests that the tract is likely to originate from the Wulfstanian circles, but not from Archbishop Wulfstan's own hand. The tract mixes OE *frið* and *grið* in a way that Wulfstan does only once, for very clear stylistic reasons. It records the compound OE *cýricfrið*, otherwise unattested in his works, where OE *cýricgrið* is preferred, and it uses OE *cýricfrið* and *grið* when referring to the fine that should be paid when the protection granted by a church is violated, and this, again, is not otherwise attested in the Wulfstanian corpus. Given the fruitful ground for research that Norse-derived terms offer, it may be of benefit to adopt a similar approach towards other texts whose authorship has been contested. Such is the purpose of the next section, which focuses on the somewhat problematic relationship between the two sets of glosses attributed to Aldred and between the two parts of the *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut*.

#### 4.3.1. *Old English Glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and to the Durham Ritual*

Aldred the Priest, the author of the colophon and Old English glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels, is commonly considered to be the same person as Aldred the Provost, who added the colophon and glosses to the Durham Ritual probably in 970. This suggestion is based in the main on palaeographic evidence

(see Ker 1943, Ross and others 1956–60: 29, and Brown 2003: 90–102), linguistic data being more problematic: Lindelöf concludes that ‘there are a sufficient number of minor divergences in spelling, in the use of abbreviations, and the grammar and the vocabulary of the two glosses [...] to render it highly improbable that they could be the work of the same man’ (Lindelöf 1927: lii; cp. Drago 1977). Jones is less sure in his analysis of the authorship of the glosses on the basis of their use of grammatical gender; he explains that the data ‘frustratingly both support and refute a single glossator hypothesis’ (C. Jones 1987: 102; cp. Hogg 2004a). Ross (Ross 1970), one of the leading figures in the study of the Aldredian glosses, acknowledges the linguistic differences between the two sets of glosses and the general linguistic conservatism of the glosses added to the Ritual, but attributes these differences to two factors: (1) Aldred may have been somewhat unsure in his choice of linguistic forms in the glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels, which are generally considered to be earlier on the basis of the handwriting and the glossator’s status, while the glosses to the Durham Ritual may represent the fact that he had ‘settled down’ and decided on one particular option; (2) Aldred the Provost tells us that he completed his work amongst the West Saxons, in Oakley (Dorset), and his hosts’ linguistic practices may have affected his own choices.

Given these differing opinions and the uncertainty surrounding the identity of the two Aldreds,<sup>17</sup> it is interesting to analyse how the Norse-derived terms function in the glosses and their contribution to the authorship debate. The following tables compare the Norse-derived terms and their equivalents in the Lindisfarne and Ritual glosses (referred to as \*Li and DurRitGl, respectively). <Ø> indicates that a lemma is not present in the Latin text.

Table 18. The Norse-derived terms and their lemmata in the glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Durham Ritual.

Latin lemma	Term(s) in *Li	Term(s) in DurRitGl
<i>ancilla</i>	<i>ðir – ðignen, ð[i/éo]we</i>	Ø
<i>audax</i>	<i>dearf – dyrstig</i>	Ø
<i>ausus</i>	<i>dyrstig</i>	<i>dearf – dyrstig</i>
<i>concitare</i>	<i>eggian – weccan</i>	Ø
<i>gratis</i>	<i>saclēas – unsynnig</i> (cf. <i>uncēaped, unbōht</i> )	Ø

<sup>17</sup> Note that *Aldred* does not seem to have been a particularly uncommon name in the community of St Cuthbert: a contemporary namesake of the glossator(s) was Bishop of Chester-le-Street (d. 968).

Latin lemma	Term(s) in * Li	Term(s) in DurRitGl
<i>mane</i>	<i>ār</i> word-field – <i>āring, merne / morgen</i>	<i>ārlic</i>
<i>materia</i>	∅	<i>efne</i>
<i>mina</i>	<i>ōra – libra</i>	∅
<i>modus</i>	<i>cost – wīse</i> (cf. L <i>modo</i> : <i>from ðissa, heona, nū, oðerhwīle, twā</i> )	<i>cost</i> (cf. L <i>modo</i> : <i>nū</i> )
<i>moechari</i>	<i>se(o)r[d/ð]an – synnian, synnig bēon</i>	∅
<i>navicula</i>	<i>flēge – (lýtēl) scip, cuopel</i>	∅
<i>nuptiae</i>	<i>brýðhlōp – fērm, hāmed, reord, symbel</i>	<i>gēmung</i>
<i>prosperare</i>	∅	<i>farnian</i>
<i>securus</i>	<i>saclēas</i> (cp. L <i>securis</i> : <i>sōðlice</i> )	<i>sorglēas, orsorg</i>
<i>servus</i>	<i>ðræ̃l(l) – esne, ðegn, ðēow(a)</i>	<i>ðræ̃l(l) – esne, ðēow(a)</i>
<i>stratum</i>	<i>song – bedd</i>	<i>bræding</i>
<i>temeritas</i>	<i>dearfscip – beldo</i>	∅
<i>tribunus</i>	<i>hold – ealdormann, his cynnes hēafodweard, forwost</i>	<i>landhæbbende, his cynnes lātteow</i>

Unfortunately, as Table 18 shows, most of the lemmata glossed by Norse-derived terms in the two sets of glosses do not overlap, and this makes any comparison between the texts very difficult. Interestingly, though, the glosses show some important differences in those cases when the same lemma does appear in the two sets of glosses. While they generally agree in their lexical choices for L *mane*, *modus*, *servus*, and terms indicating ‘presumption’ or ‘boldness’, when they have negative connotations, they clearly differ with regard to the rendering of L *tribunus*, *nuptiae*, *securus*, and *stratum* (see above, 3.4.2.9.B). These glosses, though, point in different directions: OE *hold* does not seem to have been a core member of its lexical field in the Aldredian lexicon (see above, 3.4.2.6.A.4); therefore, its absence from the glosses to the Durham Ritual is not surprising. Furthermore, despite the difference as far as the use of OE *hold* is concerned, the two glosses agree in using the structure ‘his cynnes’ (‘his people’s’) + a term meaning ‘leader’, which is otherwise unrecorded in the *OEC*. Yet, while these glosses might point towards common authorship, those to L *nuptiae* suggest instead that the glosses may be attributable to two different glossators. In the Durham Ritual, the Latin lemma is not glossed by any of the alternatives used in the Lindisfarne Gospels; instead, the glossator prefers OE *gēmung*, a seemingly uncommon term that is also chosen by Farman when glossing his section of the Rushworth Gospels. The OE *gēmung* word-field has fully taken over its

lexico-semantic field: while L *nuptialis* ‘nuptial’ is rendered by various members of the OE *brȳd* word-field in MtGl (Li) 22.11 and 22.12, OE *gēmunġlic* is selected instead when the same passage is rendered in the Durham Ritual (viz. DurRitGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 107.22 and 23).<sup>18</sup> Furthermore, whereas the fact that OE *song* appears in all its occurrences in a double gloss with OE *bedd* could be taken as an indication that the term may not have been particularly common in the glossator’s dialect/idiolect, the same cannot be easily suggested as far as OE *brȳdhlōp* and *saclēas* are concerned, because, even though they may not have been the core members of their lexico-semantic fields in Aldred’s lexicon (see above, 3.4.2.2.C.1 and 3.4.2.2.E.2), he was happy to use them by themselves when working on the Lindisfarne Gospels.

Ross’s suggestions that the Durham Ritual shows a more mature Aldred, ‘settling down’ in his linguistic choices, as well as an aware Aldred, whose habits have changed because of the influence of the new environment he is working in, might explain some of the differences in the Norse-derived terms used in the two sets of glosses. The maturity explanation is easily acceptable as far as the rendering of L *servus* is concerned, for the glosses to the Durham Ritual show a clear preference for OE *esne* over the Norse-derived term and its native (near) synonyms, and this is a trend that, as Table 19 shows, can be said to be present already in the Lindisfarne glosses.

Table 19. Number of occurrences of the terms rendering L *servus*.

Text	OE <i>esne</i>	OE <i>ðēow(a)</i>	OE <i>ðegn</i>	OE <i>ðrǣl(l)</i>
MtGl (Li)	3	10	17	3
MkGl (Li)	3	0	1	4
LkGl (Li)	25	0	2	8
JnGl (Li)	7	1	0	5
DurRitGl	19	1	0	1

Aldred’s environment may have also contributed to his preference for a non-Norse-derived term, as the near-contemporary texts of the glosses suggest that OE *ðrǣll* may not have been particularly common in non-Scandinavianized areas (see above, 3.4.2.6.A.1). The same could apply for his rejection of other Norse-derived terms, OE *brȳdhlōp* and *hold* in particular, which seem to have

<sup>18</sup> See further Ross 1978 for a full comparison of the glosses to Matthew 22. 2–14 in the Lindisfarne Gospels and the Durham Ritual.

had a similarly limited diatopic and diachronic use (see above, 3.4.2.2.E.2 and 3.4.2.6.A.4, respectively). The fact that OE *cost* appears to have been the alternative to render L *modus* that Aldred settled for would, from this perspective, be in keeping with the attestation of the term in an Æthelredian charter without any specific association with the Scandinavianized areas, although it has there a different meaning (see above, 3.4.2.2.E.1). Slightly more surprising may be the use of the OE *ār* and *dearf* word-fields, as well as OE *efne* and *farnian*, although, admittedly, their Norse-derived character is not as reliable as in other cases (see above, 2.3.2.2.A, 2.4.2.D, 2.4.2.F, and 2.4.2.H, respectively).

In conclusion, the glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and Durham Ritual have some lexical similarities, but also significant differences. Many of these, like the grammatical differences discussed by Ross (Ross 1970), could be explained as a result of the fact that Aldred's lexicon had evolved due to time and working environment. However, some cases, like the striking differences in the glosses to the L *nuptiae* word-field, remain puzzling. Thus, the use of the Norse-derived terms in the two sets of glosses could be said to hint towards double authorship; yet this hint, while intriguing, is not strong enough for single authorship to be fully rejected.

#### 4.3.2. The *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut*

In an important article in the history of scholarship on the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Dumville summarizes the eclectic character of the annals which are commonly suggested to form the *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut*:

It is very noticeable how greatly these annals [1017–22] differ in style and length from those of the years 983–1016. The detail, partisanship of an English national cause, and the freedom to offer sometimes withering comments on events, all combine to create a striking and very personal account of the events of Æthelred's long and troubled reign. By contrast, the immediately succeeding annals are mostly dry records, made without evident partisanship or concern at the direction of events. The strongly anti-Danish views expressed throughout the 1016 annal are now lacking. Only those for 1017 and 1018 may perhaps be taken as displaying concerns evident in the preceding annals. The question is how this drastic change, while yet coupled with textual-historical continuity, should be interpreted. If the text-historical evidence for continuity be permitted to dominate other considerations, then one may conclude either that after 1016 the Æthelredian chronicler learned prudence under new political circumstances or that his work was briefly continued by another, more restrained hand. However, a quite different interpretation is possible [...]. If the annals for the years after 1022, when the text histories have traditionally been brought to separate, are indeed varying derivatives of a single original

text, then the annals for 1017–22 may be taken to represent the largely unaltered beginning of that text, rather than the conclusion of the Æthelredian chronicle. Such a conclusion would concur very satisfactorily with the stylistic evidence. If the royalist ecclesiastic who wrote the annals 1035–44 be credited with those as far back as 1023, it might seem convenient to father on him those for 1017–22 (or 1019–22) also. (Dumville 1983: 26)

We have then various options:

- (1) to consider that the whole of the *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut* should be attributed to a single person;
- (2) to consider that ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 983–1016 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 983–1016 = ChronE (Irvine) 983–1016) and ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1017–22 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1017–22 = ChronE (Irvine) 1017–22) form different textual blocks, attributable to two people embarked on a single project (and, thus, for our purposes, still closely connected); or
- (3) to consider that annals ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 983–1016 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 983–1016 = ChronE (Irvine) 983–1016) and ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1017–22 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1017–1022 = ChronE (Irvine) 1017–1022) form different textual blocks, attributable to two people embarked on different projects and, probably, working in different places (and thus, for our purposes, the annals for 1017–22 should be associated with ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1035–44 and, hence, with the *Abingdon Chronicle*; see below, II.163.8).

ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 983–1016 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 983–1016 = ChronE (Irvine) 983–1016) and ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1035–44 clearly differ in terms of their use of Norse-derived vocabulary, even if we leave aside the terms which are only recorded once (viz. OE *scegð* and *hūsting* in the first set of annals and *hamele* in the second) and the terms which we would expect to differ on the basis of changes introduced by Cnut and their linguistic consequences (viz. the use of OE *hūscarl*, *marc*, and *eorl* to refer to people without a clear Scandinavian connection in the later set of annals; see above, 3.4.2.4.A and 3.4.2.6.A.4). Like the earlier annals, the Abingdon annals combine the use of OE *frið* and *grið*, but, unlike the earlier annals, they use OE *grið* with the meaning 'safe-guard, protection' (ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1041 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1041), while the Norse-derived term and its native synonym (as a simplex) mean rather 'truce, agreement to end violent hostility' in the earlier annals (see above, 3.4.2.2.D and 3.4.2.2.E.2). ChronC (O'Brien



O'Keeffe) 1035 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1035) records OE *gersum(a)*, while the earlier annals record the native (near)synonym OE *māðm* instead (ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1006 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1006 = ChronE (Irvine) 1006). Furthermore, whereas ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1014 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1014; cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1014) records the expression OE *cweðan ūtlah* to refer to the declaration of outlawry of 'every Danish king', ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1037 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1037) may avoid the use of the Norse-derived word-field, attesting instead OE *drīfan ūt* 'to drive out' (note, though, that the different nuances of these expressions do not make them fully comparable; cp. Rumball 2008: 73–74 and 83–84).

The linguistic relations of the Cnutian annals are not as easily established, though, to a great extent because of their shortness. Yet they do share with the Æthelredian annals the use of the OE *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah* word-field, the verb *ūtlagian* being recorded in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1020 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1020 = ChronE (Irvine) 1020) and ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1021 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1021 = ChronE (Irvine) 1021 = ChronF (Baker) 1021).<sup>19</sup> However, they refer to the fact that two people enter into an agreement with the expression OE *weorðan sammæle* 'to become accordant' (ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1018 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1018 = ChronE (Irvine) 1018 = ChronF (Baker) 1018) instead of OE *niman seht him betwynan* 'to take/make an agreement between themselves' (ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1016 = ChronE (Irvine) 1016 = ChronF (Baker) 1016). These linguistic traits do not suggest different authorship for the Æthelredian and Cnutian annals of the *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut* any more strongly than they point towards a single author. Therefore, as in the case of the Aldredian glosses, the debate has to be left open, and the prevalent view of a series of annals which share, if not the same author, at least the same impetus cannot be easily rejected.

#### 4.4. Conclusion

This short chapter has analysed the interaction between the Norse-derived terms and the texts where they are recorded in terms of dialectal variation and authorship. In some cases, what we know about a text can help us to deepen our understanding of the dialectal distribution of some Norse-derived terms during the Old English period, while, in other cases, what we know about the dialectal

<sup>19</sup> Note, though, that the Norse-derived verb is recorded in a near-contemporary annal of the *Abingdon Chronicle* (viz. ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1046 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1047).

distribution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in a particular text can help us narrow the text's dialectal origin. Similarly, the Norse-derived terms attested in a particular text can give us some clues about its authorship. Unfortunately, though, the conclusions derived from the analysis presented here cannot be definitive and often have to remain in the realm of speculation because of the problematic character of the texts recorded in the *OEC* (see above, 3.3). However, hopefully, the results presented in this chapter will be used by scholars to supplement other types of evidence.

The chapter has also shown that scholars should stop attributing the presence of Norse-derived vocabulary, without any further specification, to the text's origin in a Scandinavianized area. Instead, the character of the terms and their dialectal and chronological distribution must be analysed very carefully before any such judgements can be made.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

This book has attempted to present a comprehensive study of the Norse-derived vocabulary in Old English. This has required a number of decisions about what should be included in the analysis: the limits of the corpus, the terms that can actually be considered to be part of Old English (cf. the Norse-derived terms recorded in the Old English Orosius), the specific lexical items that can be accepted to be Norse-derived, etc. (see above, Chapter 1). Given the controversial character of many of these decisions, it is likely that some readers will disagree with various inclusions or exclusions. It is, however, hoped that the general principles of the study, if not all its particulars, have found the reader's approval.

Chapter 2 and Appendices III and IV have shown how important it is to go back to basics and revise the actual evidence we have to consider whether a term should be analysed as Norse-derived or not. This close scrutiny has allowed us to think about each term on its own merits, excluding from the list some terms which are sometimes presented as Norse-derived (e.g. OE *fēre*, *hæfen(e)*, and *wrang*) and including others which are not frequently identified as such (e.g. OE *frīð* in LawIICn 13). It is only by taking such a painstaking approach that we can get closer to identifying the terms that are likely to have been adopted from Old Norse during the Old English period. Unfortunately, as 2.1 makes clear, we can only make confident decisions when we have formal evidence (particularly, evidence based on phonological issues and on inflectional morphology); otherwise, the adverbs *possibly* and *probably* have to be always at the back of our minds. It is then when the scholar's judgement takes centre stage, and, in that respect, we can only welcome recent attempts to present a clear classifica-

tion of Norse-derived vocabulary in terms of degree of reliability on the basis of the extant evidence (see Dance 2011 and Dance 2013). Such approach will not (nor could it ever) replace the scholar's judgement, but at least it will make decisions more transparent. Transparency in decision-making has indeed been the ethos dominating the chapters and appendices in this book that deal with such issues, and the monograph in general.

Chapters 3 and 4 have analysed the Norse-derived terms from different perspectives: in terms of their chronological and dialectal distribution, their lexico-semantic field, and the particular text where they are recorded. This approach has had to deal with various problems associated with Old English texts: their dating, localization, and authorship. Decisions in these respects have not always been easy to make, but they are based on extant evidence. Overcoming these problems and attempting what few studies have done so far has paid off. Admittedly, most of the Norse-derived terms in English are first attested during the Middle English period, and the extant Old English texts may only show us a very small tip of what is likely to have been a significant iceberg (see, for instance, above, note 64 in Chapter 3, 3.4.2.4.A, and 4.2.2). Yet these chapters have shown that it is fundamental to analyse in detail the Norse-derived terms recorded already during the Old English period because, albeit lower in number, they can provide us with important information about the Anglo-Scandinavian sociolinguistic contact. On the one hand, they paint a picture of increasing contact between and mixing of the languages. There is, generally speaking, a fairly clear difference between the Norse-derived vocabulary first recorded during the Old and the Middle English periods, in terms of their character (with a predominance of technical terms during the Old English period and more basic terms during the Middle English period; see Appendix IV) and their form (with the terms first recorded during the Old English period showing a tendency towards phonological adaptation and avoidance of the introduction of inflectional morphology which is not as clearly present in the terms first attested in Middle English texts). Yet we can also see some evolution even during the Old English period itself. Given the nature of the initial contacts between the speakers of Old English and Old Norse, it is fairly unlikely that many Norse-derived terms entered the Old English lexicon before the settlement of the Scandinavian newcomers in the 870s. As we would expect, the first Norse-derived terms to be recorded are technical terms, associated in the main with activities where the Scandinavians had some sort of superiority in one way or another (e.g. nautical, martial, or legal activities, where the Scandinavians' superiority had to do with political domination rather than mere skill). They are also very clearly culturally marked

terms, used in close connection with those who were perceived to represent a different culture. Some of these terms point towards a diglossic situation, where Old Norse was perceived to be the dominant language, at least in some dialectal areas and activities. This exclusive association of the Norse-derived terms with a foreign group soon ceased to exist, although, as far as some terms are concerned, the exclusivity of the association still remained in terms of dialectal distribution. In the second half of the tenth century the exclusive technical character of the Norse-derived vocabulary also disappeared, the non-technical terms being the effect of closer sociolinguistic interaction between the speakers of the two languages, which seems to indicate a move, at least in some areas, towards adstratal rather than superstratal Norse influence (cp. the presence of English-derived terms in skaldic poetry, on which see Hofmann 1955: §§1–136, and the apparent morphosyntactic innovations shared by Middle English and Jutland Danish, on which see D. G. Miller 2012: ch. 5; cf. Lutz 2012a and Lutz 2012b). The linguistic impact of such close interaction reached its peak for Old English at the end of the period with the attestation of function words, which, like the presence of some non-technical terms in the Old English lexicon, may be the result of imposition by Norse speakers involved in language shift rather than borrowing by Old English speakers (see Chapter 3; cp. Hansen 1984, D. G. Miller 2010: I, 160–61, and D. G. Miller forthcoming: ch. 5). From this perspective, it is particularly interesting to see that the Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels (and the Durham Ritual), written only a few generations after the settlement of the Scandinavian newcomers, record such a significant number of non-technical terms. The glosses offer us a glimpse into some of the features of the Anglo-Scandinavian mixed linguistic varieties that are likely to have arisen in the areas of Scandinavian settlement. The glosses represent a variety developed in a peripheral area of settlement (in that respect, *possibly* comparable to Ch 898 (Kem 705), Rec 26.4 (RobApp I 3), *The Battle of Maldon*, and the *Lives of St Nicholas* and *St Giles*). The lower number of Scandinavian settlers in the area would have facilitated their integration in the local community and, therefore, an earlier language shift accompanied by the integration of Norse-derived impositions into the local mixed variety. The location of the glossator's dialect in the periphery of the Scandinavian settlement and the fact that he does not seem to have avoided lexical and grammatical variants which might have been perceived as rather local and perhaps informal is likely to account for the presence of Norse-derived non-technical vocabulary in the glosses, comparable terms being absent from (near)contemporary texts from both the Scandinavianized and non-Scandinavianized areas.

The Aldredian glosses do not include any Norse-derived function words, though (but see below, III.2.2.A). As noted above, they appear only in later texts, mainly in texts originating from areas with a significant Scandinavian presence (cf. above, 2.2.2.6). It might have taken somewhat longer for language shift to occur in these areas, but, when it eventually occurred, the larger proportion of previous Old Norse speakers may have contributed to the more significant impact of their impositions in the local variety. The wording in the Aldbrough inscription (= Inscr 1 (Ok 1)) is particularly interesting in this respect. If OE *hānum* is indeed a form of the personal pronoun for the third person singular masculine, its use as a reflexive pronoun does not conform with Old Norse usage; a form derived from the Viking Age Norse pronoun represented by OIc *sér* would have been expected instead (see Gordon 1957: §109). The term may, thus, be an example of what Trudgill calls ‘interdialect’ forms, i.e. ‘forms arising out of dialect contact which do not occur in the original dialects which are or were in contact’ (Trudgill 1986: 63). (‘Dialect’ in this context should be understood in its widest sense, i.e. referring to Old English and Old Norse as historical dialects of Proto-Germanic.)<sup>1</sup> This form could be the result of ‘extrapolation’, which, according to Hameyer (Hameyer 1979: 288), is a strategy used by speakers of mutually intelligible varieties which consists in interpreting features of the other dialect as though they were one’s own. Thus, Old English speakers might have interpreted the Norse-derived OE *hānum* as a dative form which, like OE *him*, could have both reflexive and non-reflexive meanings.

The use of this ‘interdialectal’ form is fully in keeping with the wording of the rest of the inscription: ‘ULF <HET> AROERAN CYRICE FOR <HANUM> & FOR GUN<WARA> SAVLA’ (‘Ulf had the church built for his own sake and for Gunnwaru’s soul’). The inflectional morphology of the text has clear divergences from what we would expect in classical Old English: ‘cyrice’, an accusative form of a weak feminine noun, should read <cyrican> and, therefore, shows loss of final /n/ as well as confusion of the unstressed vowels; this is also the case as far as ‘savla’ is concerned, for it should read <savle / saule>. The second element in ‘Gunwara’ may also show confusion of the unstressed vowels: this personal name is likely to represent an Anglicized version of ON *Gunnvǫr*, where the second element has been replaced with OE

<sup>1</sup> Cp. the use of the Norse-derived ME *til* ‘to’ (see below, IV.2.3.2.G) in areas adjacent to heavily Scandinavianized territories as a mark of the infinitive, possibly as an extension of the use of the preposition with nouns and on the basis of analogy with OE *tō* (see Samuels 1989: 110; cp. the MED: s.v. *til*, verbal particle, sense a).

*waru*; thus, the expected genitive singular form would be <ware>. The other personal name *Ulf* has also probably undergone a process of Anglicization, the expected nominative singular ending having been dropped, as we would expect in Old English (cf. OE *wulf* ‘wolf’ and OIc *ulfr* id.; cp. above, 2.2.2.5).<sup>2</sup> While Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact can by no means be presented as the only reason for the simplification and ultimate collapse of the Old English inflectional system, the fixation of stress in the first root syllable in the Germanic languages being also a key player in the change, it is likely that the need for communication between speakers whose languages shared many roots but not inflectional endings did contribute to the whole process (see above, 1.3.2). Indeed, we begin to see the effects of this simplification in the Aldredian glosses (see C. Jones 1987: chs 2 and 3, and Millar 2000: 77–80 and 252–53), where, as noted above, the particular impact of the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact can be clearly perceived at least at the lexical level.

Besides general differences between the texts associated with the Scandinavianized and non-Scandinavianized areas, the analysis presented in this monograph has also revealed interesting divergences as far as specific words are concerned in connection with their dialectal distribution and use, which might (although not necessarily so) be indicative of different relationships between Old English and Old Norse speakers (see above, 3.4.2.10.A.1, 3.4.2.13.C.1–2, and 4.2.5). The close scrutiny of the Norse-derived terms in their textual context and lexico-semantic fields has also allowed us to have access to issues as important as the possible reasons for the adoption and spread of the terms in Old English (e.g. trading activities in the case of the OE *scinn* word-field, the impact of royal policies and lexical practices in the case of OE *hūscarl*, *marc*, *ōra*, and the *eorl* and *lið* word-fields, the polysemic character of the native (near)synonyms in the case of OE *lagu*, *rōt*, and *ðræll*, or the possible need to render specific Latin terms in the case of OE *gestning* and *hūsbōnda*; see above, 3.4.2.1.B, 3.4.2.6.A.4, 3.4.2.4.A, 3.4.2.3.A, 3.4.2.2.A, 3.4.2.8.B, 3.4.2.6.A.1, 3.4.2.13.A, and 3.4.2.6.B.1), as well as the possible factors leading to their disappearance (e.g. social issues in the case of OE *hold* and *lȳsing*, and semantic factors as far as OE *taperex* is concerned; see above, 3.4.2.6.A.4, 3.4.2.6.A.2, and 3.4.2.3.C, respectively). It has also been possible to speculate on the likely causes leading to the presence of a particular term in a particular text; these are varied: e.g. the presence of the Norse-derived term in a text’s source (e.g. OE *holm* in ChronE (Irvine) 1025; see above, 2.4.1.C), stylistic

<sup>2</sup> On the possibility that church sundials were used by the Anglo-Scandinavians as a way of asserting their distinct identity, see above, 3.4.2.11.A.2.



needs (e.g. OE *ceallian* and *grīð* in *The Battle of Maldon*, and OE *carlfugol* and *cwenfugol* in the *Prose Phoenix*; see above, 3.4.2.7.A, 3.4.2.8.A.1, and 4.2.4), or a conscious attempt to mark Old Norse speakers as speaking a different language and thus belonging to a different culture (e.g. OE *fēolaga* in ChronD (Cubbin) 1016, OE *lȳsing* in the treaty between Alfred and Guthrum, and OE *scegðmann* in *II Æthelred*; see above, 3.4.2.2.E.2, 3.4.2.6.A.2, and 3.4.2.5.B, respectively; cp. the OE *cnearr* word-field in *The Battle of Brunanburh* and OE *hūsting* in the *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut*; see above, 2.4.1.A and 2.4.1.D, respectively). It is interesting to see that the latter usage of the Norse-derived terms appears mainly in treaties or in contexts where the Old Norse speakers are particularly demonized, i.e. in contexts where stressing their different background and standpoint might be particularly important (cf. the selection of the members of the OE *scinn* word-field possibly in an attempt to emphasize the worth of the products under discussion; see above, 3.4.2.1.B). Otherwise, this usage is not very common, which could be taken as an indication that the Norse-derived terms did not clearly stand out amongst the native vocabulary, the similarity between the two languages being a very important factor in the significant impact that Old Norse had on Old English (see above, 1.6.2.2). In fact, references to the later evolution of the Norse-derived terms recorded in Old English texts has shown that, on many occasions, they shared the same fate as their native (near)synonyms in the aftermath of the Norman Conquest: disappearance (e.g. OE *frīð* and *grīð* vs ME *pēs* ‘peace’ < AN *pes*, and ME *prôteccioun* < AN *proteccioun*; and OE *gærsum(a)* and *māðm* vs ME *trēsour* < AN *tresor*), or semantic generalization (e.g. OE *fēolaga* ‘business partner’ > ME *fēlaue* ‘companion’ vs ME *parcēner* / *partenēre* ‘associate, business partner’ < AN *parcener*; see above, 3.4.2.2.E.2 and 3.4.2.12.B.1).

Furthermore, analysing the occurrences of the Norse-derived terms in detail has allowed us to see that prose texts are clearly dominant as far as the attestation of such terms is concerned, the use of Norse-derived terms in poetry being apparently dictated by stylistic reasons or by the fact that a particular Norse-derived term had become the best option to lexicalize a particular concept. This could be taken as an indication that the terms may have been perceived as being too new, too colloquial, etc. for the conservative and somewhat distinct Old English poetic diction (see above, 4.2.4). In fact, the diverse acceptance of Norse-derived terms in connection with differing linguistic traditions, registers, and technolects can be seen not only generally but also as far as particular Norse-derived terms are concerned, the almost exclusive restriction of the attestations of OE *gærsum(a)* meaning ‘precious object, treasure’ to annalistic writing being a clear example of the latter (see above, 3.4.2.12.B.1).

In a nutshell, the picture that emerges is a very rich one, suggesting different types and levels of sociolinguistic interaction between the speakers of Old English and Old Norse, as well as different paths and fortunes for the various terms. In some cases, the terms never went further than their initial association with a foreign culture and had a limited life as far as their diachronic and/or diatopic use is concerned; in other cases, though, due to a variety of reasons, they not only lost that initial association but even became the core members of their lexico-semantic fields either in Old English or later during the Middle English period. Thus, some Norse-derived terms first recorded during the Old English period are very deeply integrated in Present Day Standard English (e.g. *law*, *take*), just one of the signs of the significant role that the Anglo-Scandinavian linguistic contact had in shaping the English language.



## RECORD OF THE NORSE-DERIVED TERMS ATTESTED IN OLD ENGLISH TEXTS

**T**his appendix provides a record of all the attestations of the Norse-derived terms in Old English texts. The layout of the records follows the presentation of information in Tables 4–17 in Chapter 3:

- (1) the Norse-derived terms are classified according to the textual groups suggested above, 3.2.3;
- (2) within each group, texts are presented in alphabetical order, unless it is clear that one attestation derives from another, in which case the text which records the attestation which seems to be the source is given first. Law-codes and charter groups are ordered independently of I–X; titles with letters are given before titles with numbers.

Only significant spellings are provided.

### I.1 ÆLDING:

#### I.1.1 **Group 6:**

I.1.1.A Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8) 5 (<hældiggæ>)

### I.2 ÆRFLE:

#### I.2.1 **Group 6:**

I.2.1.A Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8) 5 (<ærfleæ>), 9 (<hærfleæ>)

## I.3 ĀR word-field

## I.3.1 ĀR:

I.3.1.1 **Group 2:**

I.3.1.1.A \*Gl (Ru): LkGl (Ru) 21.38

I.3.1.1.B \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1:  
LkGl (Ru) 21.1, MtGl (Li) 16.3, MtGl (Li) 20.1

## I.3.2 ĀRLIC:

I.3.2.1 **Group 2:**

I.3.2.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1:  
DurRitGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 69.2, DurRitGl 2 (Thomp-Lind) 171.19

## I.3.3 ĀRLICE:

I.3.3.1 **Group 2:**

I.3.3.1.A \*Gl (Ru): JnGl (Ru) 8.2

I.3.3.1.B \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1:  
DurRitGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 85.1, DurRitGl 2 (Thomp-Lind) 167.9,  
HyGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 1.2, HyGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 9.1, JnGl (Li) 8.2,  
JnGl (Li) 21.4, LkGl (Li) 21.4 (= LkGl (Ru) 21.4), LkHeadGl (Li)  
21, MkFestGl (Li) 1, MkGl (Li) 11.20 (= MkGl (Ru) 11.20), MkGl  
(Li) 16.2 (= MkGl (Ru) 16.2), MkGl (Li) 16.9 (= MkGl (Ru) 16.9)

## I.3.4 ĀRMORGEN:

I.3.4.1 **Group 2:**

I.3.4.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1: JnGl  
(Li) 18.28 (= JnGl (Ru) 18.28), JnGl (Li) 20.1 (= JnGl (Ru) 20.1),  
JnGl (Li) 21.4 (= JnGl (Ru) 21.4)

## I.3.5 ĀRMORGENLIC:

I.3.5.1 **Group 2:**

I.3.5.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1:  
DurRitGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 124.8, DurRitGl 2 (Thomp-Lind) 182.20

## I.4 BAND:

I.4.1 **Group 6:**

I.4.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1126.8

## I.5 BARÐ word-field

## I.5.1 BARÐ:

I.5.1.1 **Group 4:**

I.5.1.1.A AntGl \* (Kindschi): AntGl 6 (Kindschi) 488

## I.5.2 BARÐA:

I.5.2.1 **Group 4:**

I.5.2.1.A AntGl \* (Kindschi): AntGl 4 (Kindschi) 1315 (<barðaða>; = BrGl 1 (Wright-Wülcker) 2.57, <barda>)

## I.6 BÄÐE:

I.6.1 **Group 6:**

I.6.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1124.36, 1127.30

## I.7 BÖNDA word-field

## I.7.1 BÖNDA:

I.7.1.1 **Group 4:**

I.7.1.1.A WCorp: HomU 29.2 (Nap 35) 52 (= LawVIIaAtr 3, <bunda>), HomU 40 (Nap 50) 187 (= LawVIAtr 32 = LawIICn 8), LawIICn 72, LawIICn 72.1, LawIICn 76.1b

I.7.1.2 **Group 5:**

I.7.1.2.A ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: ChronE (Irvine) 1048.24 (<bunda>)

I.7.1.3 **Group 6:**

I.7.1.3.A Rec 10.2 (Hickes) 1.9

## I.7.2 BÖNDELAND:

I.7.2.1 **Group 6:**

I.7.2.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 777.6

## I.7.3 HÜSBÖNDA:

I.7.3.1 **Group 3:**

I.7.3.1.A \* (WSCp): Mt (WSCp) 20.28

I.7.3.2 **Group 4:**

I.7.3.2.A AnHexa: Exod 3.22

I.7.3.3 **Group 5:**

I.7.3.3.A ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: ChronE (Irvine) 1048.25 (<husbunda>; = ChronF (Baker) 1050.15, <husbunda>), ChronE (Irvine) 1048.25 (<husbunda>; = ChronF (Baker) 1050.16, <husbunda>), ChronE (Irvine) 1048.27 (<husbunda>; = ChronF (Baker) 1050.18, <husbundan>)

## I.8 BRȚDHLŌP:

I.8.1 **Group 2:**

I.8.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1: JnArgGl (Li) 1, JnArgGl (Li) 2, LkGl (Li) 17.27 (= LkGl (Ru) 17.27), LkGl (Li) 20.34 (= LkGl (Ru) 20.34), MtGl (Li) 22.2, MtGl (Li) 25.10

I.8.2 **Group 6:**

I.8.2.A ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.39

## I.9 BRYNIGE word-field

## I.9.1 BRYNIGE:

I.9.1.1 **Group 4:**

I.9.1.1.A Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 23 (<bryn timer>)

I.9.1.1.B Ch 1537 (Whitelock 27) 7, 11 (<br timer>)

I.9.1.2 **Group 6:**

I.9.1.2.A Ch 1519 (Whitelock 34) 14 (<bren timer>)

## I.9.2 HEALSBRYNIGE:

I.9.2.1 **Group 6:**

I.9.2.1.A AldV \*: AldV 10 (Nap) 418

## I.10 CARL word-field

## I.10.1 BŮTSECARL:

I.10.1.1 **Group 6:**

I.10.1.1.A ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.11 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.19), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.25 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.32), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.21 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.18)

## I.10.2 CARLFUGOL:

I.10.2.1 **Group 6:**

I.10.2.1.A HomU 17: HomU 17.1 (Kluge E) 90–91 (= HomU 17.2 (Kluge G) 79)

## I.10.3 CARLMANN:

I.10.3.1 **Group 6:**

I.10.3.1.A ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1086.89



## I.10.4 HŪSCARL:

I.10.4.1 **Group 4:**

I.10.4.1.A Ch Cn: Ch 969 (Kem 1318) 22

I.10.4.1.B ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1041.2  
(= ChronD (Cubbin) 1041.2)I.10.4.2 **Group 5:**

I.10.4.2.A Ch ECf: {Ch 1121 (Harm 77) 8}

I.10.4.3 **Group 6:**I.10.4.3.A Ch ECf: Ch 1063 (Harm 1) 3, {Ch 1137 (Harm 93) 3, Ch  
1157 (Harm 116) 2}

I.10.4.3.B Ch 1478 (Rob 115) 35

I.10.4.3.C ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065.10

I.10.4.3.D ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1070.6

I.10.4.3.E ChronWorc: ChronD (Cubbin) 1054.6

## I.11 CEALLIAN:

I.11.1 **Group 3:**

I.11.1.A Mald 91

## I.12 CNEARR word-field

## I.12.1 CNEARR:

I.12.1.1 **Group 1:**

I.12.1.1.A Brun 35

I.12.1.2 **Group 2:**

I.12.1.2.A OccGl 45.1.2 (Meritt) 20

## I.12.2 NÆGLED CNEARR:

I.12.2.1 **Group 1:**

I.12.2.1.A Brun 53

## I.13 CNĪF:

I.13.1 **Group 3:**

I.13.1.A ÆCorp: ÆGl 315.16

I.13.2 **Group 5:**

I.13.2.A Charm 12.2 (Storms) 2

## I.14 CŌP word-field

## I.14.1 CAUPLAND:

I.14.1.1 **Group 6:**

I.14.1.1.A Ch IWm: Ch IWm (Farrer 89) 7 (<caupland>)

## I.14.2 LAHCŌP:

I.14.2.1 **Group 3:**

I.14.2.1.A Ch Æ: LawIIIATR 3 (= LawNorthu 67.1, <lahceap>)<sup>1</sup>

## I.14.3 LANDCŌP:

I.14.3.1 **Group 3:**

I.14.3.1.A Ch Æ: LawIIIATR 3 (= LawNorthu 67.1, <landceap>)<sup>2</sup>

## I.15 COST:

I.15.1 **Group 2:**

I.15.1.A Ch Æ: Ch 939 (Whitelock 16.2) 22

I.15.1.B \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1:  
DurRitGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 108.15, DurRitGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 113.21,  
JnHeadGl (Li) 37

I.15.2 **Group 3:**

I.15.2.A Ch Æ: LawIIIATR 13.3

I.15.3 **Group 4:**

I.15.3.A WCorp: WPol 6.1 (Jost) 16

## I.16 CRAFTIAN word-field

## I.16.1 CRAFTIAN:

I.16.1.1 **Group 3:**

I.16.1.1.A LawBecwæð 3.1

I.16.1.2 **Group 6:**

I.16.1.2.A Rec 10.6.2 (Dickins-Earle) 8.1

<sup>1</sup> On the relationship between LawIIIATR 3 and LawNorthu 67.1, see Tenhaken 1979: 340 and Pons-Sanz 2007b: 233.

<sup>2</sup> See above, note 1 in this appendix.

## I.16.2 UNCRAFIAN:

I.16.2.1 **Group 3:**

I.16.2.1.A Ch Æ: LawIIIAttr 14 (= LawIICn 72, <unbecrafod>)<sup>3</sup>

I.16.2.2 **Group 6:**

I.16.2.2.A Ch IWm: {Ch IWm (Douglas 7) 32}

## I.17 GECRÖCOD:

I.17.1 **Group 6:**

I.17.1.A LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): LS 9 (Giles) 519

## I.18 CWENFUGOL

I.18.1 **Group 6:**

I.18.1.A HomU 17: HomU 17.1 (Kluge E) 91 (= HomU 17.2 (Kluge G) 79)

## I.19 CWYDDIAN word-field

## I.19.1 CWYDDIAN:

I.19.1.1 **Group 3:**

I.19.1.1.A LawBecwæð 3.1

## I.19.2 UNCWYDDIAN:

I.19.2.1 **Group 3:**

I.19.2.1.A Ch Æ: LawIIIAttr 14 (= LawIICn 72)<sup>4</sup>

I.19.2.2 **Group 6:**

I.19.2.2.A Ch IWm: {Ch IWm (Douglas 7) 32}

## I.20 CYRICRĒN:

I.20.1 **Group 4:**

I.20.1.A WCorp: LawVIAttr 28.3 (<cyrircrenan>)

<sup>3</sup> On the relationship between LawIIIAttr 14 and LawIICn 72, see Wormald 1999: Table 5.4 and Pons-Sanz 2007b: 161.

<sup>4</sup> See above, note 3 in this appendix.

## I.21 DEARF word-field

## I.21.1 DEARF:

I.21.1.1 **Group 2:**

I.21.1.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1:  
LiProlMt 12 (<dearfe>), DurRitGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 100.19  
(<dearf>)

I.21.1.2 **Group 6:**

I.21.1.2.A Ch IWm: Ch IWm (Farrer 89) 9 (<deort>), Ch IWm  
(Galbraith 2) 9 (<deorf>; = Ch IWm (Galbraith 3) 8, <dorf>)

I.21.1.2.B Ch ECf: {Ch 1110 (Harm 62) 26 (<deorf>)}

I.21.1.2.C Ch IWm: Ch IWm (Farrer 89) 9 (<deort>), Ch IWm  
(Galbraith 2) 9 (<deorf>; = Ch IWm (Galbraith 3) 8, <dorf>)

## I.21.2 DEARFLIC:

I.21.2.1 **Group 2:**

I.21.2.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1:  
LiEpis 6 (<dearflicum>)

## I.21.3 DEARFLĪCE:

I.21.3.1 **Group 6:**

I.21.3.1.A LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): LS 29 (Nicholas) 383  
(<deorflice>)

## I.21.4 DEARFSCIPE:

I.21.4.1 **Group 2:**

I.21.4.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1:  
LiEpis 2 (<dearfscip>), LiProlMt 6 (<dearfscipes>), LiProlMt 12  
(<dearfscipe>)

## I.22 DRENG:

I.22.1 **Group 3:**

I.22.1.A Mald 149

## I.23 DRINCELĀN:

I.23.1 **Group 4:**

I.23.1.A WCorp: LawIICn 81 (= LawNorthu 67.1)

## I.24 EFNE:

I.24.1 **Group 2:**

I.24.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1:  
DurRitGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 116.21 (<aefne>)

## I.25 EGGIAN:

I.25.1 **Group 2:**

I.25.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1: MkGl  
(Li) 15.11 (<geeggedon>)

## I.26 EORL word-field

## I.26.1 EORL:

I.26.1.1 **Group 1:**

I.26.1.1.A Brun 31 (= ChronF (Baker) 938.4)

I.26.1.1.B Ch 544 (Birch 883) 19, 20

I.26.1.1.C ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 915.29 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 915.33)

I.26.1.1.D ChronCom: ChronA (Bately) 871.2 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 872.2 = ChronD (Cubbin) 871.2 = ChronE (Irvine) 871.2), ChronA (Bately) 871.13 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 872.12 = ChronD (Cubbin) 871.13 = ChronE (Irvine) 871.12; cp. ChronF (Baker) 871.6), ChronA (Bately) 871.16 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 872.15 = ChronD (Cubbin) 871.15 = ChronE (Irvine) 871.14), ChronA (Bately) 871.16 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 872.15 = ChronD (Cubbin) 871.16 = ChronE (Irvine) 871.14; cp. ChronF (Baker) 871.7), ChronA (Bately) 871.17, ChronA (Bately) 871.17 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 872.16 = ChronD (Cubbin) 871.17 = ChronE (Irvine) 871.15), ChronA (Bately) 871.18 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 872.16 = ChronD (Cubbin) 871.17 = ChronE (Irvine) 871.15), ChronA (Bately) 871.18 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 872.16 = ChronD (Cubbin) 871.17 = ChronE (Irvine) 871.15), ChronA (Bately) 871.39 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 872.36 = ChronD (Cubbin) 871.38 = ChronE (Irvine) 871.33 = ChronF (Baker) 871.16)

I.26.1.1.E ChronCont1: ChronA (Bately) 914.2 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 915.2 = ChronD (Cubbin) 915.3), ChronA (Bately) 914.13 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 915.11 = ChronD

(Cubbin) 915.12), ChronA (Bately) 914.13 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 915.11 = ChronD (Cubbin) 915.13), ChronA (Bately) 914.33 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 915.29 = ChronD (Cubbin) 915.32), ChronA (Bately) 916.4, ChronA (Bately) 917.32, ChronA (Bately) 917.33, ChronA (Bately) 917.55, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 911.1.12 (2x; = ChronD (Cubbin) 911.12, 2x)

**I.26.1.2 Group 2:**

I.26.1.2.A LawIVEg 15

**I.26.1.3 Group 3:**

I.26.1.3.A Ch Æ: LawIIAtr 12

I.26.1.3.B Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) 45, 65

I.26.1.3.C Ch 1659 (Rob 68) 1

I.26.1.3.D Ch 1660 (Rob 60) 1

I.26.1.3.E ChronD (Cubbin) 975.19 (= ChronE (Irvine) 975.16)

I.26.1.3.F Inscr 52 (Ok 138) 1 (?)

I.26.1.3.G Mald 6, 28, 51, 89, 146, 159, 165, 203, 233 (?)

**I.26.1.4 Group 4:**

I.26.1.4.A AntGl \* (Kindschi): AntGl 4 (Kindschi) 932

I.26.1.4.B Ch Cn: Ch 985 (Harm 26) 8, Ch 986 (Harm 28) 1 {cp. Ch 976 (Kem 753) 2, Ch 981 (Rob 85) 22, Ch 981 (Rob 85) 23 (4x), Ch 992 (Harm 53) 1, Ch 992 (Harm 53) 9 (2x)}, LawCn 1020 1 (2x), LawCn 1020 9

I.26.1.4.C Ch ECf: Ch 1073 (Harm 13) 1, Ch 1074 (Harm 14) 1, Ch 1091 (Harm 38) 1, Ch 1151 (Harm 109) 1 (= Ch 1152 (Harm 110) 1)

I.26.1.4.D Ch 1389 (Rob 89) 2

I.26.1.4.E Ch 1391 (Rob 98) 11–12 (4x)

I.26.1.4.F Ch 1394 (Rob 94) 22

I.26.1.4.G Ch 1469 (Rob 99) 5

I.26.1.4.H Ch 1471 (Rob 101) 28 (2x)

I.26.1.4.I Ch 1472 (Rob 102) 2, 8, 15

I.26.1.4.J Ch 1474 (Rob 105) 2, 9

I.26.1.4.K Ch 1530 (Whitelock 30) 9 (2x)

I.26.1.4.L Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 25, 46, 53

I.26.1.4.M ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1037.5 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1037.5), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1039.3,

ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1041.8, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1044.3 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1043a.3 = ChronF (Baker) 1043.3), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1044.13 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1043b.1 = ChronF (Baker) 1044.1), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1046.1, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1048.4

I.26.1.4.N ChronÆC: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 992.6 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 992.6 = ChronE (Irvine) 992.5), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1013.7 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1013.7 = ChronE (Irvine) 1013.7), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1016.18 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1016.18 = ChronE (Irvine) 1016.16), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1016.30 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1016.30 = ChronE (Irvine) 1016.27), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1020.5 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1020.4), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1021.2 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1021.2 = ChronE (Irvine) 1021.2 = ChronF (Baker) 1021.1)

I.26.1.4.O ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1030.3

I.26.1.4.P ChronD (Cubbin) 1023.7

I.26.1.4.Q ChronE (Irvine) 1023–41: ChronE (Irvine) 1036.4 (= ChronF (Baker) 1036.3), ChronE (Irvine) 1036.7 (= ChronF (Baker) 1036.6), ChronE (Irvine) 1036.12, ChronE (Irvine) 1040.6

I.26.1.4.R WCorp: HomU 40 (Nap 50) 54 (= HomU 46 (Nap 57) 31), LawIICn 15.2, LawIICn 71a, LawEGu 12, LawGepyncðo(H) 5, LawGrid 21.2, WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 41, WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 57 (= WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 85)

#### I.26.1.5 Group 5:

I.26.1.5.A Ch ECf: Ch 1032 (Rob 120) 16, Ch 1125 (Harm 81) 1, Ch 1126 (Harm 82) 1, Ch 1127 (Harm 83) 1, Ch 1141 (Harm 97) 1, {Ch 1047 (Rob 95) 8, Ch 1099 (Harm in Clemoes) 1, Ch 1104 (Harm 54) 1 (= Ch 945 (Harm 52) 1), Ch 1120 (Harm 76) 1, Ch 1123 (Harm 79) 1, Ch 1124 (Harm 80) 1 (2x), Ch 1143 (Harm 99) 1 (= Ch 1144 (Harm 100) 1)}

I.26.1.5.B Ch 1403 (Rob 107) 9

I.26.1.5.C Ch 1535 (Whitelock 32) 19 (2x)

I.26.1.5.D ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: ChronE (Irvine) 1045.5 (= ChronF (Baker) 1046.4), ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.9, ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.11, ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.12 (= ChronF (Baker) 1048.10), ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.15, ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.17, ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.18 (2x), ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.20, ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.21 (= ChronF (Baker) 1048.12), ChronE (Irvine)



1046b.28, ChronE (Irvine) 1048.34 (= ChronF (Baker) 1050.22), ChronE (Irvine) 1048.37 (= ChronF (Baker) 1050.23), ChronE (Irvine) 1048.42, ChronE (Irvine) 1048.50 (3x; = ChronF (Baker) 1050.26, 1x), ChronE (Irvine) 1048.56 (= ChronF (Baker) 1050.28), ChronE (Irvine) 1048.58 (2x; cp. ChronF (Baker) 1050.30, 1x), ChronE (Irvine) 1048.59, ChronE (Irvine) 1048.69 (= ChronF (Baker) 1050.33), ChronE (Irvine) 1048.69 (2x; = ChronF (Baker) 1050.34, 1x), ChronE (Irvine) 1048.73, ChronE (Irvine) 1048.76 (= ChronF (Baker) 1050.35), ChronE (Irvine) 1048.79 (2x), ChronE (Irvine) 1048.81, ChronE (Irvine) 1048.88

#### I.26.1.6 Group 6:

I.26.1.6.A Ch ECf: Ch 1063 (Harm 1) 1, Ch 1064 (Harm 2) 1, Ch 1067 (Harm 7) 1, Ch 1071 (Harm 11) 1, Ch 1072 (Harm 12) 1, Ch 1075 (Harm 15) 1, Ch 1076 (Harm 16) 1, Ch 1077 (Harm 17) 1, Ch 1079 (Harm 19) 1, Ch 1080 (Harm 20) 1, Ch 1081 (Harm 21) 1, Ch 1082 (Harm 22) 1, Ch 1083 (Harm 23) 1, Ch 1084 (Harm 24) 1 (= Ch IWm (Davis 7) 1), Ch 1085 (Harm 25) 1 (= Ch IWm (Davis 5) 1 = Ch IWm (Davis 6) 1), Ch 1088 (Harm 33) 1, Ch 1090 (Harm 35) 1, Ch 1092 (Harm 39) 1, Ch 1105 (Harm 55) 1, Ch 1113 (Harm 66) 1 (= Ch 1114 (Harm 67) 1), Ch 1132 (Harm 88) 1 (= Ch 1133 (Harm 89) 1), Ch 1139 (Harm 95) 1, Ch 1140 (Harm 96) 1, Ch 1153 (Harm 111) 1, Ch 1156 (Harm 115) 1, Ch 1161 (Harm 120) 1, Ch 1162 (Harm in Clemoes) 2, Ch 1240 (Harm 70) 1, {Ch 1045 (Kem 895) 3, Ch 1065 (Harm 4) 1, Ch 1066 (Harm 5) 1, Ch 1078 (Harm 18) 1, Ch 1089 (Harm 34) 2 (= Ch IHen (Birch) 1 = Ch IHen (PRO1907 10) 2 = Ch IHen (Somner) 2 = Ch IIHen (PRO1912 3) 3 = Ch Steph (PRO1912 2) 2), Ch 1109 (Harm 61) 1, Ch 1109 (Harm 61) 33, Ch 1109 (Harm 61) 34, Ch 1111 (Harm 64) 1, Ch 1112 (Harm 65) 1, Ch 1115 (Harm 68) 1, Ch 1116 (Harm 69) 1, Ch 1122 (Harm 78) 1, Ch 1122 (Harm 78) 5, Ch 1128 (Harm 84) 1, Ch 1129 (Harm 85) 1, Ch 1130 (Harm 86) 1, Ch 1134 (Harm 90) 1, Ch 1135 (Harm 91) 1, Ch 1136 (Harm 92) 1, Ch 1137 (Harm 93) 2, Ch 1137 (Harm 93) 12, Ch 1142 (Harm 98) 1, Ch 1147 (Harm 103) 1, Ch 1148 (Harm 104) 1, Ch 1154 (Harm 112) 9, Ch 1155 (Harm 114) 1, Ch 1157 (Harm 116) 1, Ch 1158 (Harm 117) 1, Ch 1159 (Harm 118) 1}

I.26.1.6.B Ch IHen: Ch IHen (BLAdd 29436) 1

I.26.1.6.C Ch Odo (Loyd-Stenton) 2

I.26.1.6.D Ch IWm: Ch IWm (Douglas 6) 1, Ch IWm (Dugdale 10) 1 (= Ch IWm (Hunt 2) 1), Ch IWm (Dugdale 35) 1, Ch IWm (Dugdale 39W) 1, Ch IWm (Dugdale 40) 1, Ch IWm (Farrer 12) 1, Ch IWm (Galbraith 2) 1 (= Ch IWm (Galbraith 3) 1), Ch IWm (Gibbs 3) 1, Ch IWm (Hardwick) 1, Ch IWm (Phillipps 1) 1, {Ch IWm (Douglas 7) 1, Ch IWm (Douglas 7) 2, Ch IWm (Douglas 7) 18, Ch IWm (Douglas 7) 25, Ch IWm (Douglas 7) 45, Ch IWm (Douglas 7) 50, Ch IWm (Hunt 1) 1, Ch IWm (PRO1907 3) 2}

I.26.1.6.E Ch 1232 (Rob 113) 2

I.26.1.6.F Ch 1406 (Rob 112) 14

I.26.1.6.G Ch 1409 (Rob 111) 10 (2x)

I.26.1.6.H Ch 1426 (Rob 117) 9, 10

I.26.1.6.I Ch 1476 (Rob 114) 15

I.26.1.6.J Ch 1478 (Rob 115) 2 (2x), 19, 30 (2x), 31, 45

I.26.1.6.K Ch 1519 (Whitelock 34) 42

I.26.1.6.L ChronA (Bately) 1053.1 (= Chron (CaligA 15) 1053.1)

I.26.1.6.M ChronA (Bately) 1066.1

I.26.1.6.N ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1049.10 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1050.11), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1049.12, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1049.15 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1050.14), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1049.17 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1050.17), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1049.18 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1050.18), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1049.25 (2x; cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1050.26, 1x), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1049.26 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1050.27), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1049.27 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1050.27), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1050.2, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1051.3, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.1 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.9), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.8 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.16), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.21 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.28), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.58, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1053.2 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1053.13; cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1053.1 = ChronF (Baker) 1053.1), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1053.2 (cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1053.3), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1054.1 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1054.1), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1055.1 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1055.1 = ChronE (Irvine) 1055.1 = ChronF (Baker) 1055.2; cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1055.7), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1055.5 (= ChronD (Cubbin)

1055.6 = ChronE (Irvine) 1055.3 = ChronF (Baker) 1055.2), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1055.5 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1055.6), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1055.10 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1055.10), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1055.21, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1055.23, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1055.25 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1055.16), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1056.3 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1056.5), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1056.12, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1056.13, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1056.18 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1056.14), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065.1 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.2), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065.10 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.12 = ChronE (Irvine) 1064.2), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065.14, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065.19 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.24 = ChronE (Irvine) 1064.12), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.10 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.10), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.18, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.24 (2x), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.39, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.44, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.47 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.23; cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1066.13), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.48 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.23 and ChronE (Irvine) 1066.14), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.54, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.61, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.68 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.30 and ChronE (Irvine) 1066.17), ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.50 (2x)

I.26.1.6.O ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 656.19, 656.72, 675.16, 777.17, 963.29, 1070.6, 1123.2, 1123.34, 1123.36, 1123.76, 1124.3, 1124.4, 1124.10, 1124.12, 1124.17, 1124.19, 1124.20, 1124.22, 1124.35, 1126.5, 1126.6, 1126.13, 1127.4, 1127.8, 1127.9, 1127.11, 1127.13, 1127.15, 1127.18, 1127.34, 1127.35, 1127.49, 1127.50, 1128.3 (2x), 1129.2, 1129.6, 1131.22

I.26.1.6.P ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: ChronE (Irvine) 1052.4, ChronE (Irvine) 1052.5 (= ChronF (Baker) 1051.2), ChronE (Irvine) 1052.8, ChronE (Irvine) 1052.10, ChronE (Irvine) 1052.11, ChronE (Irvine) 1052.12, ChronE (Irvine) 1052.17, ChronE (Irvine) 1052.39, ChronE (Irvine) 1052.40 (2x; = ChronF (Baker) 1051.12, 2x), ChronE (Irvine) 1052.43, ChronE (Irvine) 1052.44, ChronE (Irvine) 1052.57, ChronE (Irvine) 1052.58, ChronE (Irvine) 1052.61, ChronE (Irvine) 1052.66, ChronE (Irvine) 1055.7, ChronE (Irvine) 1055.8

I.26.1.6.Q ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1071.55, 1085a.4, 1085a.30, 1086.53, 1086.75, 1086.77, 1087.4, 1087.9, 1087.54, 1087.69; 1090.9, 1090.13, 1090.17, 1091.5, 1091.7, 1091.9, 1091.12, 1091.13, 1091.14, 1091.16, 1091.18, 1091.20, 1091.27, 1091.35, 1091.41, 1093.20, 1093.22, 1094.13, 1094.19, 1094.20, 1094.28, 1094.36, 1094.44, 1095.6, 1095.7, 1095.9, 1095.18, 1095.21, 1095.23, 1095.25, 1095.26, 1095.31, 1095.37, 1095.45, 1095.54, 1096.9, 1096.16, 1096.18 (2x), 1096.19, 1098.7, 1099.6, 1100.50, 1100.51, 1100.52, 1101.5, 1101.8, 1101.11, 1101.15, 1101.16, 1101.17, 1101.18, 1101.22, 1101.25, 1101.28, 1102.3, 1102.5, 1102.10, 1102.11, 1103.7, 1104.8, 1104.11, 1104.13, 1104.15, 1104.16, 1105.3, 1105.8, 1106.5, 1106.8, 1106.26, 1106.27, 1106.28, 1106.30, 1106.32, 1106.34 (2x), 1110.20, 1110.21, 1111.4, 1111.7, 1112.2, 1112.4, 1116.8, 1117.3, 1118.2, 1118.3 (2x), 1118.14, 1119.11, 1119.24, 1120.3, 1120.7, 1121.9

I.26.1.6.R ChronF (Baker): ChronF (Baker) 694.34, 845.1 (2x), 1009.7, 1031.3, 1048.7

I.26.1.6.S ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.16 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1064.5), ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.17 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1064.6), ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.21 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1064.10), ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.33 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1064.21), ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.35 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1064.22), ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.63, ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.17 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1066.8), ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.17 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1066.9), ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.36, ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.41 (cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1066.18), ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.65 (2x), ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.79, ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.80 (2x), ChronD (Cubbin) 1067.63, ChronD (Cubbin) 1068.2 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1068.2), ChronD (Cubbin) 1068.14, ChronD (Cubbin) 1068.23 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1069.5), ChronD (Cubbin) 1068.24, ChronD (Cubbin) 1068.25 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1069.5), ChronD (Cubbin) 1068.25, ChronD (Cubbin) 1071.1 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1070.1), ChronD (Cubbin) 1071.8 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1070.53), ChronD (Cubbin) 1071.9 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1070.54), ChronD (Cubbin) 1071.11 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1070.55), ChronD (Cubbin) 1072.1 (2x = ChronE (Irvine) 1071.1, 2x; cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1071.2 and ChronE (Irvine) 1071.3), ChronD (Cubbin) 1072.9 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1071.9), ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.2 (= ChronE (Irvine)

1075.1), ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.7 (2x = ChronE (Irvine) 1075.7, 2x), ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.10 (2x = ChronE (Irvine) 1075.10, 2x), ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.22 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1075.20), ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.23 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1075.21), ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.28 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1075.23), ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.32, ChronD (Cubbin) 1077.5 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1076.4)

I.27.1.6.T ChronWorc: ChronD (Cubbin) 1043.4 (3x), ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.16, ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.18, ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.25, ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.26, ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.41, ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.45, ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.46, ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.52, ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.53, ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.67, ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.70, ChronD (Cubbin) 1053.16 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1053.4), ChronD (Cubbin) 1055.6 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1055.3), ChronD (Cubbin) 1055.6, ChronD (Cubbin) 1055.9, ChronD (Cubbin) 1057.13 (cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1057.5 = ChronF (Baker) 1057.4), ChronD (Cubbin) 1057.16, ChronD (Cubbin) 1058.1, ChronD (Cubbin) 1061.2, ChronD (Cubbin) 1061.3, ChronD (Cubbin) 1063.1 (cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1063.1 2x), ChronD (Cubbin) 1063.10, ChronD (Cubbin) 1063.11, ChronD (Cubbin) 1063.15

I.26.1.6.U Inscr 22 (Ok 64) 5

I.26.1.6.V LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): LS 29 (Nicholas) 397, 409, 414

I.26.1.6.W Rec 26.4 (RobApp I 3) 101

I.26.1.6.Y StWulf 13, 22, 29

## I.26.2 EORLDÖM:

### I.26.2.1 **Group 4:**

I.26.2.1.A WCorp: WPol 6.2 (Jost) 135

### I.26.2.2 **Group 6:**

I.26.2.2.A ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.47 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.54), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1053.9 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1053.15 = ChronE (Irvine) 1053.3 = ChronF (Baker) 1053.2), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065.16, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.48

I.26.2.2.B ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1127.16, 1127.21

I.26.2.2.C ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: ChronE (Irvine) 1052.62, 1057.6

I.26.2.2.D ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1086.82, 1086.97, 1087.34, 1091.6, 1102.4

I.26.2.2.E ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.20 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1064.9), ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.5 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1075.4), ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.13 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1075.13), ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.16 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1075.14), ChronD (Cubbin) 1079.3

I.26.2.2.F ChronWorc: ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.16, ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.19, ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.30, ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.40, ChronD (Cubbin) 1053.16 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1053.4 = ChronF 1053.2), ChronD (Cubbin) 1055.4 (cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1055.6 = ChronF (Baker) 1055.5), ChronD (Cubbin) 1055.17

I.26.3 EORLGYFU:

I.26.3.1 **Group 4:**

I.26.3.1.A WCorp: WPol 6.2 (Jost) 135

I.26.4 EORLRIHT:

I.26.4.1 **Group 4:**

I.26.4.1.A WCorp: LawGepyncðo(H) 5

I.27 FÆT:

I.27.1 **Group 4:**

I.27.1.A Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 22 (<sadelfate>)

I.28 FARNIAN:

I.28.1 **Group 2:**

I.28.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1: DurRitGl 2 (Thomp-Lind) 176.13

I.29 FĒOLAGA word-field

I.29.1 FĒOLAGA:

I.29.1.1 **Group 3:**

I.29.1.1.A Inscr 52 (Ok 138) 1 (<feolaga>)

I.29.1.2 **Group 4:**

I.29.1.2.A Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 27 (<felage>), 29 (<felawes>)

I.29.1.3 **Group 6:**

I.29.1.3.A ChronWorc: ChronD (Cubbin) 1016.92 (&lt;feolagan&gt;)

## I.29.2 FĒOLAGSCIPE:

I.29.2.1 **Group 4:**

I.29.2.1.A Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 31 (&lt;felageschipe&gt;)

I.29.2.2 **Group 6:**

I.29.2.2.A Ch 1519 (Whitelock 34) 21 (&lt;felageschipe&gt;).

## I.30 FESTE word-field

## I.30.1 FESTE:

I.30.1.1 **Group 3:**

I.30.1.1.A Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) 2, 10

## I.30.2 FĚSTERMANN:

I.30.2.1 **Group 2:**

I.30.2.1.A Ch 1448 (Rob 39) 57

I.30.2.2 **Group 3:**

I.30.2.2.A Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) 1, 11, 16, 25, 34, 41, 43, 45, 47, 50, 53, 57, 62, 64, 68, 73, 77, 79, 82, 84, 86, 93, 95, 100, 108

I.30.2.3 **Group 5:**

I.30.2.3.A LawNorthu 2.3

I.30.2.3.B Rec 24.4 (Stevenson) 1

## I.31 FLĚGE:

I.31.1 **Group 2:**

I.31.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1: JnGl (Li) 6.22 (&lt;floege&gt;; = JnGl (Ru) 6.22, &lt;floege&gt;)

## I.32 FRA word-field

## I.32.1 FRA / FRO:

I.32.1.1 **Group 4:**

I.32.1.1.A AnHexa: Gen 28.12

I.32.1.1.B Ch 1527 (Whitelock 24) 18

I.32.1.2 **Group 5:**

I.32.1.2.A Lit 5.12.2 1



**I.32.1.3 Group 6:**

I.32.1.3.A Ch ECf: Ch 1083 (Harm 23) 8

I.32.1.3.B Ch 255 (Birch 1331–33) 3.8

I.32.1.3.C ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 656.36, 656.38, 656.41, 656.45, 656.46, 656.47, 963.15, 963.40, 993.41, 993.42, 993.43

**I.32.2 FRAWARD:****I.32.2.1 Group 6:**

I.32.2.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1127.55

**I.33 FRID word-field****I.33.1 FRID:****I.33.1.1 Group 4:**

I.33.1.1.A WCorp: LawIICn 13

**I.33.2 FRIDLĒAS:****I.33.2.1 Group 4:**

I.33.2.1.A WCorp: LawIICn 15a

**I.34 FYRRE(R):****I.34.1 Group 6:**

I.34.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1131.12 (<firrer>)

I.34.1.B Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8) 5 (<fyrræ>)

**I.35 GÆRSUM(A):****I.35.1 Group 4:**

I.35.1.A ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1035.6 (<gærsuma>; = ChronD (Cubbin) 1035.7, <garsaman>)

**I.35.2 Group 5:**

I.35.2.A ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: ChronE (Irvine) 1047.8 (<gersuman>)

I.35.2.B Rec 15 (Birch 106) 11 (<gærsuman>)

**I.35.3 Group 6:**

I.35.3.A Ch 1476 (Rob 114) 8–9 (<gersumen>)

I.35.3.B ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065.11 (<gærsuman>)

- I.35.3.C ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1070.27 (<gersumas>), 1070.30 (<gærsume>), 1070.38 (<gærsume>), 1070.40 (<gersumes>), 1070.42 (gærsume>), 1122.7 (<gersumes>), 1128.18 (<gersumes>), 1128.20 (<gærsume>)
- I.35.3.D ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1086.55 (<gersuman>), 1086.146 (<gerseman>), 1086.152 (<gersuman>), 1090.5 (<gærsuma>), 1090.17 (<gersuma>), 1095.5 (<gersuman>)
- I.35.3.E ChronF (Baker): ChronF (Baker) 995.64 (<garsuman>), 995.76 (<gærsuman>)
- I.35.3.F ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1068.29 (<gærsuman>), ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.10 (<gærsama>), ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.18 (<gærsama>), ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.26 (<gærsama>), ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.24 (<gærsuman>), ChronD (Cubbin) 1077.11 (<gærsaman>; = ChronE (Irvine) 1076.8, <gersuma>), ChronD (Cubbin) 1078.7 (<gærsuman>), ChronE (Irvine) 1079.5 (<gersuma>)
- I.35.3.G ChronWorc: ChronD (Cubbin) 1043.6 (<gærsaman>), 1052.1.62 (<gærsuman>)
- I.35.3.H LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): LS 9 (Giles) 59 (<gursumen>), LS 9 (Giles) 147 (<gyrsum>), LS 9 (Giles) 340 (<gersumes>), LS 9 (Giles) 472 (<gersumas>), LS 29 (Nicholas) 452 (<gersumen>)
- I.35.3.I Rec 10.1 (RobApp I 1) 4 (<gærsuma>)

## I.36 GĒATAN

### I.36.1 Group 6:

- I.36.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 656.70, 656.80, 656.87, 656.94, 675.7, 675.44, 675.46, 675.58, 675.61, 675.62, 963.23, 963.47, 963.51, 963.56, 1066.34, 1087.41,<sup>5</sup> 1127.48

## I.37 GESTNING:

### I.37.1 Group 6:

- I.37.1.A LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): LS 9 (Giles) 417

<sup>5</sup> On the attribution of this record to this group of annals, see above, 2.4.2.K.

## I.38 GOLDWRECEN:

I.38.1 **Group 4:**

I.38.1.A Ch 1537 (Whitelock 27) 7

## I.39 GRID word-field

## I.39.1 CYRICGRID:

I.39.1.1 **Group 4:**

I.39.1.1.A LawNorgrið 8

I.39.1.1.B WCorp: HomU 40 (Nap 50) 11 (= HomU 41 (Nap 51) 29 = LawVIAtr 14 = LawICn 2.2 = LawEGu 1 = LawGrið 2 = WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 205 = WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 100), LawVIIIAtr 1.1 (= LawICn 2.3), LawVIIIAtr 3 (= LawICn 2.5), LawVIIIAtr 4 (= LawICn 3), LawGrið 31.1 (= WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 206 = WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 101)

I.39.1.2 **Group 5:**

I.39.1.2.A LawNorthu 19

## I.39.2 GRID:

I.39.2.1 **Group 2:**

I.39.2.1.A LawIIEm 7.1

I.39.2.2 **Group 3:**

I.39.2.2.A Ch Æ: LawIIIAtr 1, 1.1, 1.2, 13

I.39.2.2.B LawPax 1

I.39.2.2.C Mald 35

I.39.2.3 **Group 4:**

I.39.2.3.A BoGl (Hale) P.3.5.56

I.39.2.3.B ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1041.8 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1041.9)

I.39.2.3.C ChronÆC: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1002.5 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1002.5 = ChronE (Irvine) 1002.5), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1004.6 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1004.6 = ChronE (Irvine) 1004.6 = ChronF (Baker) 1004.5), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1006.41 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1006.44 = ChronE (Irvine) 1006.39), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1011.12 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1011.12 = ChronE (Irvine) 1011.11), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1011.13 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1011.13 = ChronE (Irvine) 1011.12)

I.39.2.3.D ChronE (Irvine) 1023–41: ChronE (Irvine) 1037.3 (= ChronF (Baker) 1037.3)

I.39.2.3.E WCorp: HomU 40 (Nap 50) 174 (= LawVAtr 21 = LawVIAtr 26), LawVAtr 10.1 (= LawVIAtr 13 = LawGrið 31 = WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 205 = WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 100), LawVIIIAtr 1, LawICn 2.1 (2x; cp. LawGrið 31.1 2x = WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 206 2x = WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 101 2x), LawICn 2.1 (2x; = LawGrið 1 2x), LawIICn 82, LawGrið 1, LawGrið 4, LawGrið 5, LawNorgrið 5, WHom 10c 52, WHom 19 50, WHom 20.1 75 (= WHom 20.2 86 = WHom 20.3 82), WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 205 (= WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 100)

#### I.39.2.4 **Group 5:**

I.39.2.4.A ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: ChronE (Irvine) 1048.69 (= ChronF (Baker) 1050.35), ChronE (Irvine) 1048.71, ChronE (Irvine) 1048.74, ChronE (Irvine) 1048.76

I.39.2.4.B Prog 5.1 (Warn) 3

#### I.39.2.5 **Group 6:**

I.39.2.5.A Ch ECf: {Ch 1098 (Harm 45) 19}

I.39.2.5.B ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.45 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.52), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1055.9

I.39.2.5.C ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1070.15, 1070.21

I.39.2.5.D ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1087.61, 1094.3, 1094.13, 1095.11, 1095.20

I.39.2.5.E ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.35, ChronD (Cubbin) 1067.16, ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.14, ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.24, ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.27, ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.20 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1075.18)

I.39.2.5.F LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): LS 29 (Nicholas) 430

I.39.2.5.G ChronWorc: ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.15

#### I.39.3 **GRİÐBRYCE:**

##### I.39.3.1 **Group 4:**

I.39.3.1.A Ch Cn: Ch 986 (Harm 28) 4

I.39.3.1.B Ch ECf: Ch 1091 (Harm 38) 4 (= Ch IWm (Hardwick) 7)

I.39.3.1.C WCorp: LawVIIIAtr 4.1 (= LawICn 3a), LawVIIIAtr 5.1 (= LawICn 3.2), LawIICn 15, LawIICn 61

**I.39.3.2 Group 5:**

I.39.3.2.A Ch ECf: Ch 1100 (Harm 47) 6, Ch 1125 (Harm 81) 4,  
Ch 1126 (Harm 82) 5, Ch 1127 (Harm 83) 4

**I.39.3.3 Group 6:**

I.39.3.3.A Ch ECf: Ch 1084 (Harm 24) 8 (= Ch IWm (Davis 7) 7), Ch 1162 (Harm in Clemoes) 6, {Ch 1065 (Harm 4) 5, Ch 1078 (Harm 18) 8, Ch 1088 (Harm 33) 6, Ch 1089 (Harm 34) 8 (= Ch IHen (Birch) 7–8 = Ch IHen (PRO1907 10) 9 = Ch IHen (Somner) 11 = Ch IHen (PRO1912 3) 10 = Rec 6.10 (Stanley) 4 = Ch Steph (PRO1912 2) 10),<sup>6</sup> Ch 1093 (Harm 40) 6 (= Ch 1094 (Harm 41) 6 = Ch 1095 (Harm 42) 7), Ch 1109 (Harm 61) 6, Ch 1142 (Harm 98) 13–14, Ch 1146 (Harm 102) 15, Ch 1148 (Harm 104) 11, Ch 1149 (Harm 105) 6 (= Ch 1150 (Harm 106) 6)}

I.39.3.3.B Ch Taunton (RobAppI 4) 6, 12, 18, 22

I.39.3.3.C Ch IWm (Gibbs 9) 6 (= Ch IWm (PRO1908 2) 6 = Ch IHen (Gibbs 23) 5), Ch IWm (Hunt 2) 5, {Ch IWm (PRO1907 3) 7}

I.39.3.3.D Ch IIWm (PRO1906) 30

I.39.3.3.E Ch 783 (Birch 1277) 1.9

**I.39.4 GRIDIAN:****I.39.4.1 Group 4:**

I.39.4.1.A AldV \*: AldV 1 (Goossens) 2424 (= AldV 13.1 (Nap) 2473)

I.39.4.1.B ChronÆC: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1016.96 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1016.97 = ChronE (Irvine) 1016.86)

I.39.4.1.C WCorp: WHom 10c 45, WHom 20.2 38 (= WHom 20.3 37), HomU 48 (Nap 59) 58 (= LawVIATR 42.3 = HomU 27 (Nap 30) 4 = HomU 59 (Nap 37) 28; cp. LawICn 2), LawICn 4, LawGrið 3, LawGrið 24 (= LawHad 11), WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 213 (= WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 108)

**I.39.4.2 Group 5:**

I.39.4.2.A ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.9 (= ChronF (Baker) 1048.8)

**I.39.4.3 Group 6:**

I.39.4.3.A ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.26

<sup>6</sup> Given that the text of Rec 6.10 (Stanley) in the *OEC* is based on a transcript for the corpus and I do not have access to it, the line number given here is approximate.

I.39.4.3.B ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1087.49, 1087.75, 1087.79, 1093.4, 1114.4

I.39.4.3.C ChronF (Baker) 1009.16

I.39.4.3.D ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1068.6 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1068.5), ChronD (Cubbin) 1071.1 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1070.1), ChronD (Cubbin) 1073.5 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1072.4)

I.39.4.3.E ChronWorc: ChronD (Cubbin) 1063.6

I.39.4.3.F ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1070.4

I.39.5 GRIDLAGU: see below, I.54.4

I.39.6 GRIDLĒAS:

I.39.6.1 **Group 4:**

I.39.6.1.A WCorp: WHom 20.1 35 (= WHom 20.2 42 = WHom 20.3 40)

I.39.7 HĀDGRİÐ:

I.39.7.1 **Group 4:**

I.39.7.1.A WCorp: LawGrið 19

I.39.8 HÆLNESGRİÐ:

I.39.8.1 **Group 4:**

I.39.8.1.A WCorp: LawGrið 19

I.39.9 HANDGRİÐ:

I.39.9.1 **Group 4:**

I.39.9.1.A WCorp: HomU 40 (Nap 50) 11–12 (= HomU 41 (Nap 51) 30 = LawVIAttr 14 = LawICn 2.2 = LawEGu 1 = LawGrið 2 = WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 205 = WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 100)

I.39.10 UNGRİÐ:

I.39.10.1 **Group 6:**

I.39.10.1.A Ch ECf: {Ch 1098 (Harm 45) 27}

I.40 HĀ word-field

I.40.1 HĀ:

I.40.1.1 **Group 4:**

I.40.1.1.A Ch 1492 (Nap-Steven 10) 8(?) (<hanon>)

I.40.2 HĀSÆTA:

I.40.2.1 **Group 6:**

I.40.2.1.A ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: ChronE (Irvine) 1052.16

## I.41 HÆIL:

I.41.1 **Group 7:**

I.41.1.A Scrib 3.1 (Ker) 1, 2

## I.42 HAMELE:

I.42.1 **Group 4:**

I.42.1.A ChronAbing: ChronD (Cubbin) 1040.5 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1039.4; cp. ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1040.5, &lt;hamelan&gt;)

## I.43 HĀMSÖCN:

I.43.1 **Group 2:**

I.43.1.A LawIIEm 6

I.43.2 **Group 4:**

I.43.2.A Ch Cn: Ch 986 (Harm 28) 4, {Ch 976 (Kem 753) 16}

I.43.2.B Ch ECf: Ch 1091 (Harm 38) 4 (= Ch IWm (Hardwick) 7), Ch 1151 (Harm 109) 7 (= Ch 1152 (Harm 110) 8)

I.43.2.C WCorp: LawIICn 12, 15, 62 (2x)

I.43.3 **Group 5:**

I.43.3.A Ch ECf: Ch 1100 (Harm 47) 5, Ch 1125 (Harm 81) 4, Ch 1126 (Harm 82) 5, Ch 1127 (Harm 83) 5

I.43.4 **Group 6:**

I.43.4.A Ch ECf: Ch 1084 (Harm 24) 9 (= Ch IWm (Davis 7) 7), { Ch 1065 (Harm 4) 5, Ch 1078 (Harm 18) 8, Ch 1088 (Harm 33) 6, Ch 1089 (Harm 34) 8 (= Ch IHen (Birch) 10 = Ch IHen (PRO 1907 10) 9 = Ch IHen (Somner) 11 = Ch IIEHen (PRO1912 3) 11 = Ch Steph (PRO1912 2) 10), Ch 1093 (Harm 40) 6 (= Ch 1094 (Harm 41) 6 = Ch 1095 (Harm 42) 7), Ch 1098 (Harm 45) 17, Ch 1109 (Harm 61) 6, Ch 1137 (Harm 93) 16–17, Ch 1142 (Harm 98) 14, Ch 1146 (Harm 102) 15, Ch 1148 (Harm 104) 10, Ch 1149 (Harm 105) 6 (= Ch 1150 (Harm 106) 6)}

I.43.4.B Ch Taunton (RobAppI 4) 6, 11, 18, 22

I.43.4.C Ch IWm: Ch IWm (Hunt 2) 5, {Ch IWm (PRO1907 3) 7}

I.43.4.D Ch IIEWm (PRO1906) 30

I.43.4.E Ch 783 (Birch 1277) 1.11



## I.44 HĀNUM:

I.44.1 **Group 3:**

I.44.1.A Inscr 1 (Ok 1) 1

## I.45 HEALDAN:

I.45.1 **Group 6:**

I.45.1.A ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.33 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.41)

I.45.1.B ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1075.24<sup>7</sup>

I.45.1.C ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1071.7 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1070.52)

## I.46 HLĒAPAN ŪT:

I.46.1 **Group 6:**

I.46.1.A ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1072.1 (&lt;hlupon ut&gt;; = ChronE (Irvine) 1071.1, &lt;ut hlupon&gt;)

## I.47 HOFDING:

I.47.1 **Group 6:**

I.47.1.A ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.11

## I.48 HOLD:

I.48.1 **Group 1:**

I.48.1.A ChronCont1: ChronA (Bately) 904.20 (2x; = ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 905.1.17 2x = ChronD (Cubbin) 905.19 2x), ChronA (Bately) 914.34, ChronA (Bately) 917.56, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 911.1.12–14 (5x, = ChronD (Cubbin) 911.12 2x)

I.48.1.B LawNordleod 4

I.48.2 **Group 2:**

I.48.2.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1: MkGl (Li) 6.21 (= MkGl (Ru) 6.21)

<sup>7</sup> On the association of this attestation with this group of annals, see above, 4.2.1.

## I.49 HOLM:

I.49.1 **Group 4:**

I.49.1.A ChronE (Irvine) 1023–41: ChronE (Irvine) 1025.2 (= ChronF (Baker) 1052.2)

## I.50 HUNDRED:

I.50.1 **Group 3:**

I.50.1.A Ch Æ: LawIIIAtr 1.1, 1.2 (2x)

I.50.2 **Group 4:**

I.50.2.A LawNorgrið 4

## I.51 HÜSTING:

I.51.1 **Group 4:**

I.51.1.A Ch 1465 (Rob 86) 18

I.51.1.B ChronÆC: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1012.11 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1012.11 = ChronE (Irvine) 1012.10 = ChronF (Baker) 1012.9)

## I.52 HYTTAN:

I.52.1 **Group 6:**

I.52.1.A ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.27 (<hytte>)

I.52.1.B LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): LS 9 (Giles) 291 (<gehitte>)

## I.53 LÆST:

I.53.1 **Group 5:**

I.53.1.A HomS 30 (TristrApp 2) 78

## I.54 LAGU word-field

## I.54.1 ÆLAGOL:

I.54.1.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.1.1.A PrudGl 1 (Meritt) 628

## I.54.2 BURHLAGU:

I.54.2.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.2.1.A PrudGl 1 (Meritt) 14

## I.54.3 FOLCLAGU:

I.54.3.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.3.1.A WCorp: WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 17 (= WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 14; cp. LawNorthu 46), WHom 20.1 34 (= WHom 20.2 41 = WHom 20.3 39)

## I.54.4 GRIDLAGU:

I.54.4.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.4.1.A WCorp: LawGrid 9

## I.54.5 INLAGIAN:

I.54.5.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.5.1.A WCorp: LawVIIIAttr 2 (= LawICn 2.4)

I.54.5.2 **Group 6:**

I.54.5.2.A ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1050.2, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1055.24 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1055.17)

I.54.5.2.B ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1074.3<sup>8</sup>

## I.54.6 LAGIAN:

I.54.6.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.6.1.A WCorp: HomU 29.1 (Nap 36) 37 (= HomU 29.2 (Nap 35) 51), HomU 40 (Nap 50) 194 (= HomU 50 (Nap 61) 15), HomU 41 (Nap 51) 2, LawVIIaAttr 3, LawVIIIAttr 7, LawXAttrProl 1, WHom 20.1 23 (= WHom 20.2 29 = WHom 20.3 28)

I.54.6.2 **Group 6:**

I.54.6.2.A ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.33

I.54.6.2.B ChronF (Baker): ChronF (Baker) 995.14 (?)

## I.54.7 LAGU:

I.54.7.1 **Group 2:**

I.54.7.1.A AldV \*: AldV 1 (Goossens) 1935 (= AldV 7.1 (Nap) 113 = AldV 9 (Nap) 111 = AldV 13.1 (Nap) 1964 = AldV 14 (Logeman-Nap) 80; cp. AldMV 5.2 (Nap) 5 and AldV 1 (Gossens) 5109 = AldV 13.1 (Nap) 5226)

I.54.7.1.B LawIVEg 2.1, 12, 13.1

I.54.7.2 **Group 3:**

I.54.7.2.A ÆCorp: ÆEtat 109, ÆGram 59.15, ÆHex 24, ÆHom 1 465, ÆHom 7 201, ÆHom 8 17, ÆHom 9 190, ÆHom 14

<sup>8</sup> On the association of this attestation with this group of annals, see above, 4.2.1.

203, ÆHom 14 208, ÆHom 16 10, ÆHom 16 30, ÆHom 16 35, ÆHom 16 62, ÆHom 16 81, ÆHom 16 126, ÆHom 21 34, ÆHomM 8 (Ass 3) 11, ÆHomM 8 (Ass 3) 274, ÆHomM 14 (Ass 8) 151, ÆLet 4 (SigewardB) 367 (= ÆLet 4 (SigewardZ) 367), ÆLet 4 (SigewardB) 374 (= ÆLet 4 (SigewardZ) 373), ÆLet 4 (SigewardB) 414 (= ÆLet 4 (SigewardZ) 414), ÆLet 5 (Sigefyrth) 58, ÆLS (Sebastian) 283

I.54.7.2.B Ch Æ: LawIAtr 0.2, LawIIIAtr 0.1, LawIIIAtr 3.4, LawIIIAtr 8.2, LawIIIAtr 13.3

I.54.7.2.C ChrodR 1 71.2

I.54.7.2.D JDay II 164 (= HomU 26 (Nap 29) 123)

I.54.7.2.E ProspGl 2.48

#### I.54.7.3 Group 4:

I.54.7.3.A AldV \*: AldV 1 (Goossens) 2140 (= AldV 13.1 (Nap) 2178), AldV 1 (Goossens) 4725 (= AldV 13.1 (Nap) 4844)

I.54.7.3.B AnHexa: Deut 4.8, Deut 4.44, Exod 29.28, Lev 26.45

I.54.7.3.C BenRGl 53.88.13, 58.97.5

I.54.7.3.D ByrM 1 (Baker/Lapidge) 2.1.157

I.54.7.3.E Ch Cn: LawCn 1020 13 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1018.7)<sup>9</sup>

I.54.7.3.F Ch ECf: Ch 1103 (Harm 51) 5

I.54.7.3.G HlGl (Oliphant) D2

I.54.7.3.H HomM 15 (Wanley) 10.2 (<lage>)

I.54.7.3.I HomU 27 (Nap 30) 15, 180

I.54.7.3.J HomU 32 (Nap 40) + HomU 34 (Nap 42): HomU 32 (Nap 40) 123, HomU 34 (Nap 42) 90, HomU 34 (Nap 42) 94, HomU 34 (Nap 42) 287

I.54.7.3.K HomU 46 (Nap 57) 15 (<laga>), 94

I.54.7.3.L LawNorgrið 1

I.54.7.3.M LawRect 1, 6.4, 21.3

I.54.7.3.N PrudGl 1 (Meritt) 12, 411

I.54.7.3.O WCorp: ChronD (Cubbin) 959.5 (= ChronE (Irvine) 959.6), ChronD (Cubbin) 959.11 (= ChronE (Irvine) 959.15 = ChronF (Baker) 958.6), ChronD (Cubbin) 975.12, HomU 21

<sup>9</sup> On the relationship between the Cnutian degree and the 1018 annal, see Wormald 1999: 129–33; see also Pons-Sanz 2010: 280.

(Nap 1) 61, HomU 29.2 (Nap 35) 59, HomU 40 (Nap 50) 50, HomU 40 (Nap 50) 60, HomU 40 (Nap 50) 198 (= HomU 50 (Nap 61) 20), HomU 41 (Nap 51) 8, HomU 41 (Nap 51) 30, HomU 48 (Nap 59) 19 (= LawICn 21), HomU 48 (Nap 59) 56 (= HomU 59 (Nap 37) 27 = LawVIAtr 42.2), HomU 49 (Nap 60) 11, HomU 49 (Nap 60) 19, HomU 50 (Nap 61) 21, LawIAs 2, LawVAttr 1.1 (= LawVIAtr 8 = LawXAttr 2 = LawIICn 1), LawVAttr 10 (= LawVIAtr 11 = LawICn 6.3), LawVAttr 30 (= LawVIAtr 37), LawVIAtr 12.2 (= HomU 40 (Nap 50) 171 = HomU 48 (Nap 59) 42 = LawICn 7.3), LawVIAtr 37 (2x), LawVIAtr 49, LawVIAtr 50 (= LawNorthu 66), LawVIIIAtr 5.1 (= LawICn 3.2), LawVIIIAtr 30 (= WCan 1.1.2 (Fowler) 68 = WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 77), LawVIIIAtr 37 (2x), LawVIIIAtr 43, LawVIIIAtr 43.1, LawXAttrProl 2, LawAð 2, LawCn 1020 9, LawIICn 15, LawIICn 15a, LawIICn 15.1, LawIICn 15.1a, LawIICn 15.2 (2x), LawIICn 15.3 (2x), LawIICn 34, LawIICn 62 (2x), LawIICn 65 (2x), LawIICn 75.2, LawIICn 83, LawGepyncðo 1, LawGrið 6, LawGrið 7, LawGrið 9, LawGrið 11, LawGrið 13, LawHad 11, LawMirce 0.1, LawMirce 1, LawMirce 2, LawMirce 3, LawNorðleod 0.1, LawNorðleod 6, WHom 1b 9, WHom 3 30, WHom 5 82, WHom 5 115 (cp. HomU 48 (Nap 59) 5 = WPol 2.2.1 (Jost) 2, LawIICn 84.1 = WPol 6.2 (Jost) 147, and LawGrið 19), WHom 6 103, WHom 6 104, WHom 8c 25, WHom 8c 28, WHom 8c 68, WHom 8c 131, WHom 8c 132, WHom 9 62, WHom 9 145, WHom 10a 9, WHom 10c 10, WHom 10c 14, WHom 10c 19, WHom 10c 23, WHom 10c 33, WHom 10c 120, WHom 10c 165, WHom 10c 201, WHom 11 196, WHom 12 88, WHom 13 5, WHom 15 35, WHom 15 38, WHom 17 22, WHom 17 36 (= LawICn 26 = LawGrið 19.1 = WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 42), WHom 19 5, WHom 19 60, WHom 19 72, WHom 20.1 21 (= WHom 20.2 27 = WHom 20.3 26), WHom 20.1 32 (= WHom 20.2 38 = WHom 20.3 37), WHom 20.1 44 (= WHom 20.2 57 = WHom 20.3 49 = HomU 40 (Nap 50) 62), WHom 20.1 102 (= WHom 20.2 144 = WHom 20.3 146), WHom 20.1 121 (cp. WHom 20.2 169 = WHom 20.3 193), WHom 20.2 103 (= WHom 20.3 106), WHom 20.3 65, WHom 20.3 66, WHom 21 32, WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 6 (= HomU 40 (Nap 50) 18), WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 17 (= WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 14; cp. LawNorthu 46), WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 76, WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 210 (= WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 105)

I.54.7.3.P \* (WSCp): Mt (WSCp) 15.2, Mt (WSCp) 15.3, Mt (WSCp) 15.6, Mk (WSCp) 7.8, Mk (WSCp) 7.9, Mk (WSCp) 7.13

**I.54.7.4 Group 5:**

I.54.7.4.A ArPrGl 1 (Holt-Campb) 42.17

I.54.7.4.B Ch ECf: Ch 1124 (Harm 80) 9, {Ch 1104 (Harm 54) 5  
(= Ch 945 (Harm 52) 4)}

I.54.7.4.C HomU 59 (Nap 37) 2

I.54.7.4.D LawNorthu 0.1

I.54.7.4.E LibSc + IsidSent (Cornelius): IsidSent (Cornelius) 278  
(2.21.2), LibSc 1.26, LibSc 1.29, LibSc 3.3, LibSc 3.55, LibSc 7.10,  
LibSc 12.21, LibSc 14.37, LibSc 29.3, LibSc 31.3, LibSc 32.64,  
LibSc 32.74, LibSc 45.1, LibSc 45.29, LibSc 65.3, LibSc 81.32,  
LibSc 81.34 (3x)

**I.54.7.5 Group 6:**

I.54.7.5.A Ch ECf: Ch 1083 (Harm 23) 7, {Ch 1098 (Harm 45) 4}

I.54.7.5.B Ch IHen: Ch IHen (BLAdd 29436) 4,<sup>10</sup> 8

I.54.7.5.C Ch IWm: Ch IWm (Gibbs 5) 10, Ch IWm (Robertson) 2,  
Ch IWm (Stevenson) 34, LawWLLad 1.1

I.54.7.5.D ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.52  
(= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.58)

I.54.7.5.E ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1125.24

I.54.7.5.F ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1086.27,  
1086.109, 1087.40, 1093.5, 1093.10, 1100.32

I.54.7.5.G ChronWorc: ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.27 (= ChronE  
(Irvine) 1064.15)

I.54.7.5.H LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): LS 29 (Nicholas) 407

I.54.7.5.I LS 28 (Neot) 172<sup>11</sup>

I.54.7.5.J OccGl 28 (Nap) 19

**I.54.7.6 Group 7:**

I.54.7.6.A LawOrdal 6

**I.54.8 LAHBRECA:****I.54.8.1 Group 5:**

I.54.8.1.A LibSc + IsidSent (Cornelius): LibSc 2.24

<sup>10</sup> Line numbers for this document are given in accordance with Bates's edition (Bates 1998: 977), rather than following the original manuscript lineation.

<sup>11</sup> On this context, which has a Wulfstanian ring, see Wilcox 2000: 86–87 and Dance forthcoming a.

## I.54.9 LAHBRECEDE:

I.54.9.1 **Group 5:**

I.54.9.1.A LibSc + IsidSent (Cornelius): LibSc 2.23

## I.54.10 LAHBRYCE:

I.54.10.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.10.1.A WCorp: LawVAtr 25 (= LawVIAtr 28.3), WHom 20.1  
93 (= WHom 20.2 134 = WHom 20.3 136)

## I.54.11 LAHCĒAP AND LAHCŌP : see above, I.14.2

## I.54.12 LAHLIC:

I.54.12.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.12.1.A WCorp: WÆLet 2 131.

I.54.12.2 **Group 5:**

I.54.12.2.A LibSc + IsidSent (Cornelius): LibSc 9.49

I.54.12.3 **Group 6:**

I.54.12.3.A Ch IWm: LawWILad 2.1

## I.54.13 LAHLĪCE:

I.54.13.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.13.1.A RegCGI (Kornexl) 27.569

I.54.13.1.B WCorp: HomU 48 (Nap 59) 15 (= WPol 2.2.1 (Jost) 6),  
WHom 20.1 60 (= WHom 20.2 73 = WHom 20.3 65)

## I.54.14 LAHMANN:

I.54.14.1 **Group 5:**

I.54.14.1.A LawDuns 3.2

## I.54.15 LAHRIHT:

I.54.15.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.15.1.A WCorp: LawVAtr 31 (= LawVAtr 38), LawEpisc 6

## I.54.16 LAHSLITE:

I.54.16.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.16.1.A WCorp: HomU 49 (Nap 60) 11, LawVAtr 31, LawVIAtr  
51, LawIICn 15.1a, LawIICn 15.3, LawIICn 49, LawEGu 2, LawEGu  
3, LawEGu 3.2, LawEGu 4.1, LawEGu 6, LawEGu 6.1, LawEGu 6.2,  
LawEGu 6.3, LawEGu 6.4 (= LawIICn 48), LawEGu 7.1 (= LawIICn  
46), LawEGu 7.2 (= LawIICn 45.3), LawEGu 9

I.54.16.2 **Group 5:**

I.54.16.2.A LawNorthu 20, 21, 22, 51, 52, 53, 54



## I.54.17 LAHWITA:

I.54.17.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.17.1.A WCorp: WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 48

## I.54.18 LAHGEWRIT:

I.54.18.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.18.1.A WCorp: WHom 10a 3

## I.54.19 LANDLAGU:

I.54.19.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.19.1.A LawRect 4.4, 21

## I.54.20 MÆGLAGU:

I.54.20.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.20.1.A WCorp: LawVIIIAttr 25 (= LawICn 5.2d)

## I.54.21 PRĒOSTLAGU:

I.54.21.1 **Group 5:**

I.54.21.1.A LawNorthu 2.3

## I.54.22 REGOLLAGU:

I.54.22.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.22.1.A WCorp: LawVIIIAttr 25 (= LawICn 5.2d)

## I.54.23 RIHTLAGU:

I.54.23.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.23.1.A WCorp: HomU 41 (Nap 51) 6, LawVIIIAttr 36  
 (= LawHad 11), LawIICn 31a, LawGrið 24, WHom 20.1 101  
 (= WHom 20.2 142 = WHom 20.3 144), WHom 21 13

## I.54.24 ðEGNLAGU:

I.54.24.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.24.1.A LawRect 1

I.54.24.1.B WCorp: LawICn 6.2a (= HomU 40 (Nap 50) 155),  
 WPol 6.2 (Jost) 135

## I.54.25 UNLAGAGIELD

I.54.25.1 **Group 6:**

I.54.25.1.A ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1090.19

## I.54.26 UNLAGU:

I.54.26.1 **Group 4:**

I.54.26.1.A Ch Cn: Ch 987 (Harm 29) 5

I.54.25.1.B WCorp: ChronD (Cubbin) 975.17, LawVAtr  
 1.1 (= LawVIAtr 8 = LawXAtr 2 = LawIICn 1), LawVAtr 24

(= LawVIAtr 28.2), LawVAtr 32, LawVAtr 33, LawVAtr (D) 32.4, LawVIAtr 40 (= LawIICn 11), LawXAttrProl 2, LawIICn 15.1, LawIICn 60, WHom 11 175, WHom 20.1 11 (= WHom 20.2 17 = WHom 20.3 16), WHom 20.1 42 (= WHom 20.2 48 = WHom 20.3 46), WHom 20.2 56, WHom 20.3 181, WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 39 (= WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 32), WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 97, WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 227 (= WPol 2.1.2 (Jost) 121 = HomU 27 (Nap 30) 14)

#### I.54.26.2 **Group 6:**

I.54.26.2.A Ch ECf: Ch 1077 (Harm 17) 7, Ch 1113 (Harm 66) 5, {Ch 1112 (Harm 65) 10, Ch 1157 (Harm 116) 6 (= Ch 1163 (Harm 71) 10)}

I.54.26.2.B Ch IWm: Ch IWm (Gibbs 3) 8

I.54.26.2.C ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.53 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.59), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065.16

I.54.26.2.D ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1086.26, 1086.27

I.54.26.2.E Rec 10.1 (RobApp I 1) 9

#### I.54.27 ÜTLAGA / ÜTLAH:

##### I.54.27.1 **Group 2:**

I.54.27.1.A Ch 1377 (Rob 37) 11

I.54.27.1.B LawHu 3

##### I.54.27.2 **Group 3:**

I.54.27.2.A ÆCorp: ÆGl 303.5 (= AntGl 6 (Kindschi) 110), ÆGram 39.14, ÆGram 70.5, ÆGram 276.7, ÆIntSig 47.308

I.54.27.2.B Ch Æ: LawIAtr 1.9a (= LawIICn 30.9), LawIAtr 1.13 (= LawIICn 31.2), LawIIAtr 1.2, LawIIAtr 7.1

##### I.54.27.3 **Group 4:**

I.54.27.3.A AldV\*: AldV 1 (Goossens) 374 (= AldV 13.1 (Nap) 275)

I.54.27.3.B ChronÆC: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1014.14 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1014.17; cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1014.13 = ChronF (Baker) 1014.12)

I.54.27.3.C HomU 46 (Nap 57) 141

I.54.27.3.D HyGl 2 (Milfull) 3.8, 13.3, 48.2

I.54.26.3.E WCorp: HomU 40 (Nap 50) 95, LawVIIIAtr 42, LawCn 1020 17 (= HomU 40 (Nap 50) 179), LawIICn 4.1, LawIICn 13, LawIICn 39, LawIICn 41.2, LawIICn 66.1, LawEGu 6.6 (= LawIICn 48.2)

**I.54.27.4 Group 5:**

I.54.26.4.A ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: ChronE (Irvine) 1048.62  
(= ChronF (Baker) 1050.33)

**I.54.27.5 Group 6:**

I.54.27.5.A ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–61: ChronE (Irvine) 1052.65  
(= ChronF (Baker) 1051.25)

I.54.27.5.B ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1070.16,  
1070.17, 1070.35, 1071.8<sup>12</sup>

I.54.27.5.C ChronWorc: ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.49

I.54.27.5.D LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): LS 29 (Nicholas) 493

**I.54.28 ÜTLAGIAN:****I.54.28.1 Group 3:**

I.54.28.1.A ÆCorp: ÆHom 9 13, ÆHom 9 173, ÆHom 9 180,  
ÆHom 13 52, ÆLS (Cecilia) 131

**I.54.28.2 Group 4:**

I.54.28.2.A ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1046.5  
(= ChronD (Cubbin) 1047.5)

I.54.28.2.B ChronÆC: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1020.3  
(= ChronD (Cubbin) 1020.2 = ChronE (Irvine) 1020.2), ChronC  
(O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1021.2 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1021.2 = ChronE  
(Irvine) 1021.2 = ChronF (Baker) 1021.1)

**I.54.28.3 Group 6:**

I.54.28.3.A ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.53  
(= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.58), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe)  
1055.5 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1055.5 = ChronE (Irvine) 1055.3; cp.  
ChronF (Baker) 1055.1), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1065.16

I.54.28.3.B ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.12 (= ChronE  
(Irvine) 1064.2),<sup>13</sup> ChronD (Cubbin) 1068.41 (= ChronE (Irvine)  
1069.2)

I.54.28.3.C ChronWorc: ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.46

**I.54.29 ÜTLAGU:****I.54.29.1 Group 3:**

I.54.29.1.A Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) 36, 69

<sup>12</sup> On this occurrence of the term, see Pons-Sanz 2010: 294.

<sup>13</sup> On the possibility that the use of this verb may be a Worcester interpolation (and should, therefore, be associated with ChronWorc), see below, II.163.17.

**I.54.29.2 Group 6:**

I.54.29.2.A Ch IWm: LawWILad 3, 3.1

**I.54.30 WORULDLAGU:****I.54.30.1 Group 4:**

I.54.30.1.A Ch Cn: LawCn 1020 2

I.54.30.1.B WCorp: HomU 40 (Nap 50) 51 (= WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 38), HomU 40 (Nap 50) 62, HomU 41 (Nap 51) 2, HomU 41 (Nap 51) 19 (= LawIICn 64), LawVIIIatr 36, LawXAtrProl 1, LawIICn 38.2, LawGrid 24

**I.55 LIÐ word-field****I.55.1 LIÐ:****I.55.1.1 Group 6:**

I.55.1.1.A ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.15 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.22), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.17 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.24), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.18 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.26), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.29 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.36), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.46 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.53), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1055.7, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.11 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.11), ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.28, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.29, ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.59

I.55.1.1.B ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1068.33, ChronD (Cubbin) 1071.6 (= ChronE (Irvine) 1070.51)

I.55.1.1.C ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: ChronE (Irvine) 1052.18<sup>14</sup>

I.55.1.1.D ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1069.7<sup>15</sup>

**I.55.2 LIÐSMANN:****I.55.2.1 Group 4:**

I.55.2.1.A ChronE (Irvine) 1023–41: ChronE (Irvine) 1036.5 (<liðsmen>)

<sup>14</sup> Despite the independence of this part of the E-text from the C- and D-texts, and even though the wording in their 1052 annal is not closely associated (see below, II.163.20), there is some similarity between ChronE (Irvine) 1052.17–19 and ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1052.18–19 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.2.25–27 (cp. Irvine 2004: lxxvi).

<sup>15</sup> On the association of this attestation with this group of annals, see above, 4.2.1.

**I.55.2.2 Group 5:**

I.55.2.2.A ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.34 (<litsmen>), 1047.2 (<litsmanna>)

**I.55.2.3 Group 6:**

I.55.2.3.A ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1050.9 (<litsmen>)

**I.55.3 SCIPLIÐ:****I.55.3.1 Group 6:**

I.55.3.1.A ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1055.26

**I.55.4 SUMORLIDA:****I.55.4.1 Group 1:**

I.55.4.1.A ChronCom: ChronA (Bately) 871.29 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 872.26 = ChronD (Cubbin) 871.28 = ChronE (Irvine) 871.24)

**I.56 LOFT:****I.56.1 Group 3:**

I.56.1.A ÆCorp: ÆHex 171<sup>16</sup>

**I.57 LȚSING:****I.57.1 Group 1:**

I.57.1.A LawAGu 2 (B <liesengum>, B2 <lysyngon>)

**I.57.2 Group 6:**

I.57.2.A Ch 1529 (Whitelock 36) 3 (<lisingar>)

**I.58 MĀL word-field****I.58.1 FORMĀL(A) / FORMĀEL:****I.58.1.1 Group 3:**

I.58.1.1.A Ch Æ: LawIIAtr 1 (<formalan>)

I.58.1.1.B LawSwer 1 (<formæl>).

**I.58.2 FRIÐMĀL:****I.58.2.1 Group 3:**

I.58.2.1.A Ch Æ: LawIIAtr 0.1

<sup>16</sup> See also above, 4.2.2.

## I.58.3 MĀL:

I.58.3.1 **Group 6:**

I.58.3.1.A ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1049.42 (<scylode [...] of male>), 1050.10, 1055.27

I.58.3.1.B ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: ChronE (Irvine) 1052.59 (<bær ... up his mal>; = ChronF (Baker) 1051.22–23, <bær ... up his mal>)

I.58.3.1.C ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1086.21

I.58.3.1.D Rec 8.2 (RobApp I 2) 2, 4

## I.58.4 MĀLDÆG:

I.58.4.1 **Group 4:**

I.58.4.1.A Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 36

## I.58.5 SAMMÆLE:

I.58.5.1 **Group 3:**

I.58.5.1.A Ch 1455 (Rob 62) 3

I.58.5.1.B Ch Æ: LawIIIAtr 13.2

I.58.5.2 **Group 4:**

I.58.5.2.A ChronÆC: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1018.6 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1018.6 = ChronE (Irvine) 1018.5 = ChronF (Baker) 1018.4)

I.58.5.2.B LawWif 6

## I.58.6 WIÐERMĀL:

I.58.6.1 **Group 6:**

I.58.6.1.A ChronWorc: ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.41–42 (<cuman to wiðermale>), 1052.1.47 (<cumenne to wiðermale>)

## I.59 MANSLOT:

I.59.1 **Group 2:**

I.59.1.A Ch 659 (Birch 1029) 26–27 (<manna hlot>), 28 (<manna hlot>), 29 (<manna hlot>)

I.59.2 **Group 6:**

I.59.2.A Rec 5.4 (Rob 104) 10 (<manslot>), 11 (<manslot>, 2x), 12 (<manslot>), 13 (<manslot>), 14 (<manslot>, 2x)

## I.60 MARC word-field

## I.60.1 HEALFMARC:

I.60.1.1 **Group 1:**

I.60.1.1.A LawAGu 2

I.60.1.2 **Group 3:**

I.60.1.2.A Ch Æ: LawIIIAttr 1.2, 3.2, 12, 13.2, 13.4

I.60.1.3 **Group 4:**

I.60.1.3.A Ch 1469 (Rob 99) 3

I.60.1.3.B Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 25, 26

I.60.1.4 **Group 5:**

I.60.1.4.A LawNorthu 48, 49, 51, 52, 58, 60

I.60.1.5 **Group 6:**

I.60.1.5.A Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8) 10

I.60.1.5.B Rec 23.3 (RobApp I 6) 9

## I.60.2 MARC:

I.60.2.1 **Group 4:**

I.60.2.1.A Ch 1389 (Rob 89) 3

I.60.2.1.B Ch 1465 (Rob 86) 17

I.60.2.1.C Ch 1468 (Rob 97) 5

I.60.2.1.D Ch 1473 (Rob 103) 3

I.60.2.1.E Ch 1490 (Whitelock 28) 7, 10

I.60.2.1.F Ch 1521 (Whitelock 29) 12

I.60.2.1.G Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 22, 25, 26, 33

I.60.2.1.H Ch 1537 (Whitelock 27) 8

I.60.2.1.I ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1040.5  
 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 1040.5 = ChronE (Irvine) 1039.9 = ChronF  
 (Baker) 1039.5)

I.59.2.1.J ChronE (Irvine) 1023–41: ChronE (Irvine) 1039.4

I.60.2.2 **Group 5:**

I.60.2.2.A Ch 1489 (Whitelock 26) 12, 20

I.60.2.2.B Ch 1499 (Whitelock 35) 5

I.60.2.3 **Group 6:**

I.60.2.3.A Ch Ulf (Whitelock 39) 8

I.60.2.3.B Ch 1426 (Rob 117) 3, 6

I.60.2.3.C Ch 1519 (Whitelock 34) 28



- I.60.2.3.D ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1066.38
- I.60.2.3.E ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1086.153, 1101.19, 1103.9
- I.60.2.3.F ChronWorc: ChronD (Cubbin) 1058.9
- I.60.2.3.G Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8) 11 (2x)
- I.60.2.3.H Rec 23.3 (RobApp I 6) 5, 6, 8, 9

## I.61 MUND:

### I.61.1 **Group 4:**

- I.61.1.A Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 36

## I.62 NĀM

### I.62.1 **Group 4**

- I.62.1.1 WCorp: LawIICn 19

## I.63 NĪÐING word-field

### I.63.1 NĪÐING:

#### I.63.1.1 **Group 3:**

- I.63.1.1.A LawWal 1

#### I.63.1.2 **Group 6:**

- I.63.1.2.A ChronAbing: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1049.36

### I.63.2 UNNĪÐING:

#### I.63.2.1 **Group 6:**

- I.63.2.1.A ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1087.73

## I.64 NORREN:

### I.64.1 **Group 6:**

- I.64.1.A ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.35 (<norna>), ChronE (Irvine) 1066.11 (<norrena>), and ChronE (Irvine) 1066.14 (<norrena>)

## I.65 ŮC (?):

### I.65.1 **Group 7:**

- I.65.1.A Scrib 3.1 (Ker) 2

## I.66 ÆRA word-field

## I.66.1 ÆRA:

I.66.1.1 **Group 2:**

I.66.1.1.A Ch 1448 (Rob 39) 32

I.66.1.1.B \*Gl (Ru): LkGl (Ru) 19.16

I.66.1.1.C \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1:  
 LkGl (Li) 19.13 (= LkGl (Ru) 19.13), Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) 10,  
 Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) 14

I.66.1.1.D Rec 9.4 (Thorpe) 44, 45

I.66.1.2 **Group 3:**

I.66.1.2.A Ch Æ: LawIIIAttr 1.2, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 5, 8.2, 9.1, 12

I.66.1.2.B Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) 76

I.66.1.2.C Rec 9.1 (RobApp II 9) 3 (<oran>), 4, 6 (2x), 7, 10, 11, 17,  
 24, 25

I.66.1.3 **Group 4:**

I.66.1.3.A Ch 1469 (Rob 99) 4

I.66.1.3.B Ch 1537 (Whitelock 27) 9

I.66.1.3.C Rec 23.4 (Ker) 1 (2x)

I.66.1.3.D WCorp: LawEGu 3.2, 7

I.66.1.4 **Group 6:**

I.66.1.4.A Rec 2.3 (Earle) 1.4

I.66.1.4.B Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8) 1 (2x), 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11

I.66.1.4.C Rec 5.4 (Rob 104) 8, 70, 71, 72, 73

## I.66.2 ȚRE / ĖRE:

I.66.2.1 **Group 3:**

I.66.2.1.A Ch Peterb (Rob 40) 79

I.66.2.2 **Group 6:**

I.66.2.2.A Rec 2.3 (Earle) 15.2

I.66.2.2.B Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8) 9

## I.67 ORREST:

I.67.1 **Group 6:**

I.67.1.A Ch IWm: Ch IWm (Davis 6) 3

I.67.1.B ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1096.6

## I.68 PLÖGESLAND:

I.68.1 **Group 4:**

I.68.1.A Ch Cn: Ch 968 (Farrer) 15, 16, 17, 18, 18–19, 21, 22

I.68.1.B Rec 24.1 (Rob 84) 3, 4, 8 (2x), 11, 12, 19, 20, 22, 22–23

## I.69 RENNAN:

I.69.1 **Group 6:**

I.69.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCnt: ChronE (Irvine) 656.47, 963.42

## I.70 RÖT word-field

## I.70.1 RÖT:

I.70.1.1 **Group 6:**

I.70.1.1.A LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): LS 9 (Giles) 120, 243

I.70.1.2 **Group 7:**

I.70.1.2.A Med 5.8 (Cockayne) 11.1

## I.70.2 RÖTFÆST:

I.70.2.1 **Group 6:**

I.70.2.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1127.43

## I.71 SAC word-field

## I.71.1 SAC:

I.71.1.1 **Group 3:**

I.71.1.1.A Ch Æ: LawIIIAtr 3

## I.71.2 UNSAC:

I.71.2.1 **Group 3:**

I.71.2.1.A LawBecwæð 3.1

I.71.2.2 **Group 4:**

I.71.2.2.A WCorp: LawVAtr (D) 32.4

## I.72 SACLĒAS:

I.72.1 **Group 2:**

I.72.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1: JnGl (Li) 15.25 (= JnGl (Ru) 15.25), MtGl (Li) 24.14

I.72.2 **Group 3:**

I.72.2.A Ch Æ: LawIIIAtr 3.1

**I.72.3 Group 4:**

I.72.3.A Ch Cn: {Ch 951 (Davidson) 31}

**I.72.4 Group 6:**

I.72.4.A Ch ECf: {Ch 1116 (Harm 69) 3}

I.72.4.B Ch IHen: Ch IHen (Clarke) 5

I.72.4.C Ch Lambourn (RobAppI 5) 2

I.72.4.D ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1091.7, 1106.39

I.72.4.E Rec 4 (Först) 30.6, 33.6

I.72.4.F Rec 10.6.2 (Dickins-Earle) 1.3, 2.2, 3.2, 4.1, 5.2, 7.3, 9.2, 11.2, 12.2, 16.3, 19.4

**I.73 SAHT word-field****I.73.1 SAHT, n. (?):****I.73.1.1 Group 6:**

I.73.1.1.A ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1091.19  
(<sæhte>)

**I.73.2 SAHT(E), a. (?):****I.73.2.1 Group 6:**

I.73.2.1.A ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1077.1  
(<sæhte>)

**I.73.3 SAHTLIAN (?):****I.73.3.1 Group 6:**

I.73.3.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1066.37  
(<sahtloden>), 1070.37 (<sæhtlod>)

I.73.3.1.B ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1091.40  
(<gesæhtlad>)

**I.73.4 SAHTNES (?):****I.73.4.1 Group 6:**

I.73.4.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1066.38  
(<sahtnysse>)

**I.73.5 UNSAHT, n. (?):****I.73.5.1 Group 6:**

I.73.5.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1123.36  
(<unsæhte>)

## I.74 SANDERMANN:

I.74.1 **Group 6:**

I.74.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1123.2, 1123.36

## I.75 SCEGÐ word-field

## I.75.1 SCEGÐ:

I.75.1.1 **Group 3:**

I.75.1.1.A Ch 1487 (Whitelock 13) 35

I.75.1.2 **Group 4:**

I.75.1.2.A AldV \*: AldV 1 (Goossens) 120 (<scehp>; = AldV 13.1 (Nap) 28, <scehp>; = AldV 4 (Nap) 17, <scehp>)

I.75.1.2.B AntGl \* (Kindschi): AntGl 4 (Kindschi) 1318 (<sceigð>; = AntGl 6 (Kindschi) 476, <sceip>; = BrGl 1 (Wright-Wülcker) 2.58, <scægð>)

I.75.1.2.C Ch 1492 (Nap-Steven 10) 5 (<scegð>)

I.75.1.2.D ChronÆC: ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1008.3 (<scegð>; = ChronD (Cubbin) 1008.3, <scægð>; = ChronE (Irvine) 1008.3, <scegð>; = ChronF (Baker) 1008.2, <scegð>)

## I.75.2 SCEGÐMANN:

I.75.2.1 **Group 3:**

I.75.2.1.A ÆCorp: ÆGram 24.9 (<scegðman>; = AntGl 2 (Kindschi) 252, <scegðman>)

I.75.2.1.B Ch Æ: LawIIAtr 7 (<sceiðman>)

## I.76 SCEPPE:

I.76.1 **Group 6:**

I.76.1.A Rec 5.4 (Rob 104) 2, 5

## I.77 SCĒR:

I.77.1 **Group 6:**

I.77.1.A Ch Lambourn (RobAppI 5) 2

## I.78 SCINN word-field

## I.78.1 GRĀSCINNEN:

I.78.1.1 **Group 6:**

I.78.1.1.A ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.12

## I.78.2 HEARMASCINNEN:

I.78.2.1 **Group 6:**

I.78.2.1.A ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.12

## I.78.3 SCINN:

I.78.3.1 **Group 6:**

I.78.3.1.A ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.11

I.78.3.1.B Rec 10.1 (RobApp I 1) 29

## I.79 SCORU:

I.79.1 **Group 6:**

I.79.1.A Rec 5.4 (Rob 104) 62, 64

## I.80 SE(O)R[D/Ð]AN:

I.80.1 **Group 2:**

I.80.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1: MtGl (Li) 5.27 (&lt;serð&gt;)

## I.81 SÖLMERCA:

I.81.1 **Group 5:**

I.81.1.A Inscr 22 (Ok 64) 2

## I.82 SONG:

I.82.1 **Group 2:**

I.82.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1: LkGl (Li) 22.12, MkGl (Li) 14.15

## I.83 STICCA:

I.83.1 **Group 3:**

I.83.1.A Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) 90

## I.84 STÖR:

I.84.1 **Group 6:**

I.84.1.A ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: ChronE (Irvine) 1085b.21

## I.85 SWEGEN:

I.85.1 **Group 6:**

I.85.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1128.4

## I.86 TACAN word-field

## I.86.1 OFTACAN:

I.86.1.1 **Group 6:**

I.86.1.1.A LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): LS 29 (Nicholas) 113

## I.86.2 TACAN:

I.86.2.1 **Group 6:**

I.86.2.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 1127.17  
(<wið toc>), 1127.56

I.86.2.1.B ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1072.13, 1075.32,  
1076.26, 1076.30

I.86.2.1.C LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): LS 29 (Nicholas) 288  
(<ontæcþ>), 316 (<toc on>)

## I.86.3 WÆPENTAC:

I.86.3.1 **Group 2:**

I.86.3.1.A LawIVEg 6 (<wæpengetace>)

I.86.3.2 **Group 3:**

I.86.3.2.A Ch Æ: LawIIIAttr 1.2, 3.2, 3.3

I.86.3.2.B Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) 33

I.86.3.3 **Group 5:**

I.86.3.3.A LawNorthu 57.2 (<wæpengetace>)

I.86.3.4 **Group 6:**

I.86.3.4.A Ch IWm: Ch IWm or IIWm (Salter) 5

## I.87 TAPERÆX:

I.87.1 **Group 5:**

I.87.1.A Ch 959 (Rob 82) 21 (= ChronA (Bately) 1031.8 = ChronF  
(Baker) 1029.7)

## I.88 TOFT:

I.88.1 **Group 3:**

I.88.1.A Ch Peterbor (Rob 40) 21, 38



I.88.1.B Ch 1525 (Whitelock 37–38) 12, 13

I.88.1.C LawBecwæð 3

**I.88.2 Group 4:**

I.88.2.A Ch Cn: Ch 968 (Farrer) 6

I.88.2.B Ch 898 (Kem 705) 22

I.88.2.C Ch 1527 (Whitelock 24) 4, 6, 11, 13

I.88.2.D Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 8 (<tuft>), 44 (<tuft>)<sup>17</sup>

**I.89 ÐĪR:**

**I.89.1 Group 2:**

I.89.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1: JnGl (Li) 18.17 (= JnGl (Ru) 18.17)

**I.90 ÐORP:**

**I.90.1 Group 6:**

I.90.1.A ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: ChronE (Irvine) 963.25

**I.91 ÐRÆL(L) word-field**

**I.91.1 ÐRÆL(L):**

**I.91.1.1 Group 2:**

I.91.1.1.A \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1: DurRitGl 1 (Thomp-Lind) 21.12 (<ðræles>), JnGl (Li) 8.34 (<ðræl>; = JnGl (Ru) 8.34, <ðræl>), JnGl (Li) 15.15 (<ðrællas> and <ðræll>; = JnGl (Ru) 15.15, <ðrælas> and <ðræl>), JnGl (Li) 15.20 (<ðræl>; = JnGl (Ru) 15.20, <ðræl>), LkHeadGl (Li) 24 (<ðræl>), LkHeadGl (Li) 53 (<ðræles>), LkGl (Li) 7.8 (<ðræle>), LkGl (Li) 12.43 (<ðræl>; = LkGl (Ru) 12.46, <ðræl>), LkGl (Li) 12.46 (<ðrælles>; = LkGl (Ru) 12.46, <ðræles>), LkGl (Li) 15.26 (<ðrælum>), LkGl (Li) 19.13 (<ðrælas>; = LkGl (Ru) 19.13, <ðræles>), MkGl (Li) 10.44 (<ðræl>; = MkGl (Ru) 10.44, <ðræl>), MkGl (Li) 13.34 (<ðrællum>; = MkGl (Ru) 13.34, <ðrælum>), MkGl (Li) 14.47 (<ðræl>; = MkGl (Ru) 14.47, <ðræl>), MtHeadGl (Li) 63 (<ðræles>), MtGl (Li) 24.50 (<ðrælas>)

<sup>17</sup> On this spelling, see above, note 41 in Chapter 2.

**I.91.1.2 Group 3:**

I.91.1.2.A Ch Æ: LawIIAtr 5.1 (<þræl>)

**I.91.1.3 Group 4:**

I.91.1.3.A WCorp: LawVIIaAtr 3 (<þræl>), LawGrið 21.2 (<þræl>; = WPol 6.2 (Jost) 137, <þræl>), WHom 9 128 (<þrælas>), WHom 20.2 51 (<þrælas>), WHom 20.2 98 (<þræla>; = WHom 20.3 102, <þræla>), WHom 20.2 101 (<þræle> and <þræl>; = WHom 20.3 104, <þræle> and <þræl>), WHom 20.2 102 (<þræl>; = WHom 20.3 105, <þræl>), WHom 20.2 115 (<þræl>; = WHom 20.3 117, <þræl>), WHom 20.2 116 (<þræle>; = WHom 20.3 118, <þræle>), WPol 6.2 (Jost) 145 (<þrælas>)

**I.91.1.4 Group 5:**

I.91.1.4.A ÆColl 201 (<þrælas>)

**I.91.2 ÐRÆĽRIHT:****I.91.2.1 Group 4:**

I.91.2.1.A WCorp: WHom 20.1 43 (= WHom 20.2 48 = WHom 20.3 47)

**I.92 ÐREFE:****I.92.1 Group 2:**

I.92.1.A Ch 1448 (Rob 39) 38

**I.93 ÐRINNA:****I.93.1 Group 3:**

I.93.1.A Ch Æ: LawIIIAtr 13

**I.94 WÆÐ:****I.94.1 Group 6:**

I.94.1.A ChronNor2: ChronD (Cubbin) 1073.4

**I.95 WALRĒAF:****I.95.1 Group 3:**

I.95.1.A LawWal 1

## OLD ENGLISH TEXTS RECORDING NORSE-DERIVED TERMS

**T**his appendix complements the information presented in 3.3. It explains the reasons behind the attribution of each text or group of texts to a particular chronological period and their association with the Scandinavianized or non-Scandinavianized areas. In some cases, it is not a whole text that is attributed to a particular period, but just part of it, or part of the Norse-derived terms recorded in it; this is particularly the case with regard to the various versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. Texts are arranged alphabetically according to the abbreviations used to refer to them so as to facilitate their localization in the appendix.

II.1 *ÆColl*: The authorship of the eleventh-century Old English glosses to *Ælfric's Colloquy* has been widely debated. Garmonsway (Garmonsway 1978: 15–16) does not identify anyone as the possible author of the glosses, but rejects *Ælfric's* authorship, while Lendinara (Lendinara 1981: 188–202) attributes the glosses to *Ælfric* himself. Porter (Porter 1996: 643; Porter 1997: 43) has recently assigned them to *Ælfric's* pupil *Ælfric Bata* (fl. s. xi<sup>1</sup>) or his school, and Hill (J. Hill 1998: 146) accepts Porter's opinion. Garmonsway (Garmonsway 1978: 16) and Gneuss (Gneuss 1997: 40) have identified some south-eastern features in the glosses, but it is not clear whether they should be associated with *Bata's* possible connection with Canterbury (see Brooks 1984: 266),<sup>1</sup> or with the fact that the only manuscript where they are recorded

<sup>1</sup> On what is known about *Bata*, see Kornexl 1993: cxxx–cxxxiv, Porter 1995, Lapidge

(viz. London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A.iii) has been attributed to Christ Church, Canterbury, by Gneuss (Gneuss 1997). Ker (Ker 1990: no. 186, art. 11) dates the glosses in the Tiberius manuscript to the mid-eleventh century, which can be used as a *terminus ad quem* for them. While the date of the actual composition of the glosses remains unclear, there is nothing to suggest that they should be associated with the Scandinavianized areas (*pace* Pelteret 1995: 317).

II.2 ÆCorp: The works of the West-Saxon scholar Ælfric of Eynsham can be dated to 989 x *c.* 1010 (see Clemoes 2000: 56–57). However, it is important to point out that, even though his works are included in Group 3 and those of Archbishop Wulfstan II of York are included in Group 4, it is generally accepted that Ælfric started using *lagu*, to a great extent, under the influence of the Wulfstanian lexical choices (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 231 and 245–46, with references). The works included under this heading for the purposes of this study are ÆEtat, ÆGl, ÆGram, ÆHex, ÆHom 1, ÆHom 7, ÆHom 8, ÆHom 9, ÆHom 13, ÆHom 14, ÆHom 16, ÆHom 21, ÆHomM 8 (Ass 3), ÆHomM 14 (Ass 8), ÆIntSig, ÆLet 4 (SigewardB), ÆLet 4 (SigewardZ), ÆLet 5 (Sigefyrth), ÆLS (Cecilia), ÆLS (Sebastian).

II.3 AldMV 5.2 (Nap): See below, II.4.1.

II.4 AldV \*: The relationship between the various layers of glosses to Aldhelm's *Prosa de virginitate* is a very complex one, and one that would take much longer than the space available here to explore in detail. Such analysis has been impeccably conducted by Gwara (Gwara 2001: I, ch. 4), and the reader is, therefore, referred to his work for a detailed study of this issue. While Gwara argues in favour of seeing Canterbury as the centre from which this glossing tradition developed and where it was expanded, Gretsch (Gretsch 1999: chs 5 and 9) would like to emphasize the role played by Æthelwold and the houses he was associated with, particularly Abingdon. In any case, there is no clear association between the glosses and the Scandinavianized areas. As far as chronology is concerned, suffice it to say that, for our purposes, there are three main batches of glosses:

1999a, with references, and Banham 2006: 240–41.

II.4.1 Some glosses would have been associated with the Aldhelmian text already in the late tenth century, as suggested by their presence in three Canterbury manuscripts: London, British Library, MS Royal E.xi (= AldV 7.1 (Nap)), London, British Library, MS Royal A.vi (= AldV 9 (Nap)), and Salisbury, Cathedral Library, MS 38 (= AldV 14 (Logeman-Nap)). It is with this layer of glosses that the presence of OE *lagu* amongst the late tenth-century glosses to Aldhelm's *Carmen de virginitate* in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson C 697 (= AldMV 5.2 (Nap); see Ker 1990: no. 349) should be associated (see above, 3.3.2). The whereabouts of the manuscript after it was imported from the continent are not fully clear; however, it seems that Rawlinson C 697 is associated with other manuscripts containing glosses to Aldhelm's works, and that association is likely to have taken place in Glastonbury or Canterbury (see O'Brien O'Keeffe 1985: 67, Gretsches 1999: 350–51, and Gwara 2001: i, 122–47).

II.4.2 Other glosses are attributable to the early eleventh century. The main manuscript in this respect is Brussels, Royal Library, MS 1650 (= AldV 1 (Goossens)), which dates from the first half of the eleventh century and is likely to have been written in Canterbury (see Gwara 2001: i, 94–101) or Abingdon (see Porter 1999: 170, with references). Many of the Old English glosses in this manuscript were copied into Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Digby 146 (= AldV 13.1 (Nap)), and Hereford, Cathedral Library, MS P.I.17 (= AldV 4 (Nap)), a direct descendant of the Digby manuscript.

II.4.3 Other glosses are only recorded in the late eleventh century. That is the case of some of the glosses in London, British Library, MS Royal 6 B.vii (= AldV 10 (Nap)), a late eleventh-century manuscript from Exeter.

II.5 AnHexa: Even though, traditionally, the anonymous (i.e. non-Ælfrician) components of the Old English Hexateuch have been attributed to a single author,<sup>2</sup> who was also believed to have revised the Ælfrician translations (see Clemoes 1974a: 42), Marsden (Marsden 2000: 68–81) points out that there are enough stylistic differences to argue against single authorship, and that, in fact, there may have been at least three different translators: (1) the translator of the anonymous part of Genesis and Exodus 1–17 (approximately), (2) the translator of the later part of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers 1–2, and (3) the translator of Deuteronomy. Yet, multiple authorship does not have

<sup>2</sup> The portions attributable to Ælfric are Genesis 1–3, 6–9, and 12–24.22, Numbers 13–31, and the whole of the Book of Joshua except for 1.1–10 and 12 (see Clemoes 2000: 36).

to be associated with multiple centres. Indeed, Marsden (Marsden 2000: 83) suggests that it is likely that the original of the Hexateuch compilation, probably planned around the existing Ælfrician texts, was conducted at a single centre. Given that the work of the anonymous translators is based on Ælfric's (see Clemoes 1974a: 47, and Marsden 2000: 41), that Ælfric is likely to have finished his translations in the early eleventh century (see Clemoes 2000: 56), and that the earliest manuscript of the Hexateuch (viz. London, British Library, MS Cotton Claudius B.iv) dates from the second quarter of the eleventh century (see Ker 1990: no. 142), the translations can be included in Group 4. Regarding the place where the translators may have worked, Baker, following but slightly altering Clemoes's view (Clemoes 1974a: 50–53), argues in favour of the possibility that the Hexateuch and the *Poenitentiale Pseudo-Ecgberti* are 'products of Ramsey, or some nearby centre where a similar dialect might have been written' (Baker 1980: 32). The similarity between Byrhtferth's and the anonymous translators' language is not fully clear, though. We need to wait for Richard Marsden's analysis of the latter in the second volume of his edition of the Old English Heptateuch before any decision on the localization of the place of translation and compilation can be made. One further point should be noted in association with the language of the texts. Clemoes explains that 'by the earliest stage to which our extant copies witness, the text had already acquired serious defects' (Clemoes 1974b: 54), and this may make the lexical attestations slightly problematic.

II.6 AntGl\* (Kindschi): The so-called Antwerp-London glossaries are recorded in two manuscripts from the first half of the eleventh century: Antwerp, Plantin Moretus Museum, MS 16.2, and London, British Library, MS Add. 32,246 (see Ker 1990: no. 2). Given that the same hand has worked on Brussels 1650 and in the Antwerp-London glossaries (see Ker 1990: no. 2, and Porter 1999: 171–81), the origin of the latter should be associated with that of Brussels 1650 (see above, II.4.2). Porter (Porter 1999: 183) explains the contents of the main Antwerp-London glossary as follows:

Despite the great reliance on the *Glossary* [i.e. Ælfric's glossary], many original items have been edited out, so that Ælfric's vocabulary accounts for less than a fifth of the items. New words are of every description, but to generalize they tend to be rare and exotic.

On the relationship between the glossaries and Ælfric's glossary and grammar, see further Porter (Porter 1997: 66–68, and Porter 1999: 183–85 and 189–91),

and Lazzari (Lazzari 2003), who argues instead that Ælfric's glossary and the Plantin-Moretus Glossaries derive independently from a shared set of glossarial material. On the relationship between AntGl 4 (Kindschi) and AntGl 6 (Kindschi), see Porter 1999: 185–86.

II.7 ArPrGl 1 (Holt-Campb): Ker (Ker 1990: no. 135) explains that the Old English glosses to the prayers in London, British Library, MS Arundel 155 were written more or less at the same time as the rest of the manuscript, i.e. c. 1050. Given that the manuscript is likely to originate from Christ Church, Canterbury, the glosses could also be attributed the same origin (cp. J. J. Campbell 1963: 83, and Hofstetter 1987: 440–41).

II.8 BenRGl: Logeman explains that this interlinear gloss to the *Benedictine Rule* has 'no connection whatever' with the translation attributed to Æthelwold (Logeman 1888: xxx–xxxi). The manuscript where it is included, London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A.iii, was written c. 1050, and the gloss seems to have been entered by the same scribe who wrote the Latin text (see Ker 1990: no. 186). On the basis of linguistic features, Logeman (Logeman 1888: xxxix and lxiii) suggests that the original gloss from which the extant text was copied is likely to have originated in Kent in the early eleventh century. Hofstetter (Hofstetter 1988: 153) has shown that the gloss shares a high number of lexical items with other texts of the so-called Winchester group. These two features can be combined when we think about the association of the manuscript with Canterbury, and Ælfric's student Ælfric Bata (see above, II.1, and Porter 1997: 68–69). In any case, there is no reason to associate the glosses with the Scandinavianized areas.

II.9 BoGl (Hale): These glosses to Boethius's *De consolazione philosophiae* are recorded in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 214. Ker (Ker 1990: no. 51) dates them to the early eleventh century (cp. Hale 1978: 23). Page (Page 2001: 235) suggests that the Old English glosses to Book III, where OE *grið* is recorded (see above, I.39.2.3.A), were inserted before the grammatical glosses, which can be dated between the beginning and the middle of the eleventh century (see Page 2001: 232). The scriptorium where the glosses were added (and, probably, where the manuscript was written) is unknown, although Hale (Hale 1978: 24 and 33–34) presents Abingdon as a possibility on the basis of the similarities between the Corpus manuscript and Cambridge, University Library, MS Kk.3.21, which may originate from that house. However, as noted



by Stokes, the attribution of the latter to Abingdon is ‘by no means necessary’ (Stokes 2005: 26).

II.10 BrGl 1 (Wright-Wülcker): These glosses are included in a glossary recorded in Brussels, Royal Library, MS 1828–30, a manuscript from the first half of the eleventh century (see Ker 1990: no. 9). The entries of the nautical section of the glossary are clearly based on those recorded in the Antwerp–London glossaries (on which see above, II.6; see Simmonds 1984: 44 and 53 n. 8), although the Brussels 1828–30 glossary also shares material with (1) the so-called Corpus glossary, viz. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 144, (2) the so-called Épinal–Erfurt glossary, viz. Épinal (Vosges), Bibliothèque municipale, MS 72 + Erfurt, Codex Amplonianus, f. 42, and (3) the Cleopatra glossaries (see Rusche 1996: 554–66). Given that the Corpus and the Cleopatra glossaries were written in St Augustine’s, Canterbury (see Ker 1990: nos 36 and 143, respectively, and Rusche 1996: 1–6), and that Canterbury is also likely to be the place where the Antwerp–London glossaries were written down, the compiler of the Brussels 1828–30 glossaries may have also worked there (Ker 1990: no. 9 does not give an origin for the manuscript, though).

II.11 ByrM 1 (Baker/Lapidge): Baker and Lapidge (Baker and Lapidge 1995: xxvi–xxvii) date the composition of Byrhtferth’s *Enchiridion* to 1010 x 1012. Given that most of Byrhtferth’s career is supposed to have been spent in Ramsey, Huntingdonshire (see Lapidge 1999b), it is not surprising that they associate the text, from a linguistic perspective, with other East Anglian works (Baker and Lapidge 1995: xciv–cxv).

II.12 Brun: On the date and dialectal origin of *The Battle of Brunanburh*, see above, 2.4.1.A. Given that the text could be dated to 937 x c. 955 and that it seems to be associated with the first rather than the second half of the tenth century, it is included in Group 1.

II.13 Ch Æ: The charters and writs associated with Æthelred, Cnut, Edward the Confessor, William the Conqueror, and Henry I are grouped together and presented as representing the language of the secretariat of each king. The existence of a royal chancery during the tenth and eleventh centuries is a highly debated topic among Anglo-Saxon historians.<sup>3</sup> Keynes (Keynes 1980

<sup>3</sup> See Insley 1998: 177–84 for a summary and evaluation of the main points presented by those involved in the debate.

and Keynes 1990) is one of the main advocates in favour of its existence. In his opinion, the production of the documentary materials was in most cases consequent to the meeting of the *witan*, which implies that the office producing them was able to follow the *witan*. Chaplais (Chaplais 1965–69 and Chaplais 1995), on the other hand, denies its existence and prefers to assign these documents to ecclesiastical scribes, who worked on the basis of the oral message delivered on the king's behalf at the *witenagemot* or a shire-meeting. Bates (Bates 1998: 96–109) and Insley (Insley 1998) maintain a conciliatory approach, which Keynes (Keynes 1980: 28, 82–83, and 120–25) had already suggested. According to this view, 'production by, or on behalf of, the beneficiary could exist alongside production by scribes acting on behalf of the king' (Insley 1998: 183). Even in those cases where the texts would have been drafted by the beneficiaries, the consistency in phraseology would point towards 'a convincing picture of central activity and of direct intervention in the production of documents' (Bates 1998: 108). Spurious documents have also been associated with the language of the respective secretariats because one of the elements to make a forgery credible is the use of the legal phraseology of the time (something which, admittedly, is not always achieved).

Please note that Wormald explains that tenth-century legal tracts, including Æthelred's earlier (i.e. non-Wulfstanian) codes, 'are something in the nature of minutes of what was orally decreed, rather than statute law in their own right. They probably owe their preservation and extant form to those who used, rather than those who issued, them' (Wormald 1978: 48). In that respect, they are comparable to other legal texts of Æthelred's reign which are attributable to the beneficiaries rather than the court itself. Therefore, for the sake of consistency, I–III Æthelred are also included in this section.

The Norse-derived terms recorded in the following documents can be grouped together as representing the language of Æthelred's secretariat:<sup>4</sup>

II.13.1 Authentic documents produced either by Æthelred's secretariat or by the beneficiary:

<sup>4</sup> For a clear explanation of the differences between diplomas, writs (and 'writ-charters'), and charters, see Sharpe 2003: 248–53. Sharpe explains with regard to writs (and their sub-category writ-charters) that 'the beneficiary is likely to have asked the king for a document — and surely paid a handsome "fine" for the privilege. The writ was then drawn up and given to the beneficiary, who would deliver it to the shire court. [...] At the meeting of the shire court it would be presented to the presiding officers as a letter from the king' (Sharpe 2003: 252–53). On Ch 909 (Kem 709), see below, IV.1.14.

II.13.1.1 Ch 898 (Kem 705): In this document, from 1001, King Æthelred grants lands at Long Itchington and Arley, Warwickshire, to Clofig (see Hart 1975: no. 68, and Keynes 1980: 257). The grant was recorded almost at the same time in London, British Library, MS Cotton Augustus II.22. There is no clear evidence about whether the document was produced by the royal secretariat or whether it was a local product (see Keynes 1980: 125 n. 135, and 135 n. 171). The lands and the archive of the document, Coventry, can be considered to be at the borderline between English and Danish Mercia. Thus, even though there may not have been a significant amount of Scandinavian settlers in the area, linguistic contact with people coming from Scandinavianized areas may not have been too uncommon (cp. Gelling 1992: 136).

II.13.1.2 Ch 939 (Whitelock 16.2): Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 147–48) dates this document to 995 x 999 and possibly 997. On its origin, see above, 2.5.C.

II.13.1.3 LawIAtr: Wormald (Wormald 1999: 321) notes that this Æthelredian code declares itself to be a decree issued at Woodstock ‘according to English law’ (‘æfter Engla lage’; LawIAtr 0.2). Its exact date of promulgation remains unclear.

II.13.1.4 LawIIAtr: Keynes (Keynes 1991: 103–04) argues that the text represents the agreement between Æthelred and the Vikings after the attacks of 994. Even though the text is only preserved in a twelfth-century manuscript (viz. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 383; see Ker 1990: no. 65), the presence of ‘sceidmannus’ in the *Quadripartitus* suggests that the Norse-derived terms could be associated with the period of composition rather than with the actual writing of the manuscript.

II.13.1.5 LawIIIAtr: This code, which was promulgated in Wantage, has a significant presence of Norse-derived terms; they are commonly associated with the fact that the text is likely to represent the legal practice in the Five Boroughs. Thus, Wormald explains that ‘along with a transmission mediated by local government action go strong indications that its language was a locality’s’ (Wormald 1999: 327; cp. Neff 1989, and Wormald 1999: 28–29). The lack of Wulfstanian vocabulary in the text could be taken as indication that it was drafted before Wulfstan became Bishop of Worcester and Archbishop of York, i.e. before 1002 (see Orchard 1999, with references). This tallies with the fact that there seems to have been a gathering of the ‘regime’s great and good’ at Wantage in 997 (Wormald 1999: 328). The fact that the text represents a ‘provincial

initiative' (Wormald 1999: 329) rather than a text closely associated with the court could make this statement problematic; however, given that Wulfstan seems to have used the text when composing LawEGu (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 138 and 208; on the date of LawEGu, see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 20, with references, and below, II.257.15), its attribution to the late tenth century or the early eleventh century seems very appropriate.

II.14 Ch Cn: The Norse-derived terms recorded in the following documents can be grouped together as representing the language of Cnut's secretariat (see above, II.13):

II.14.1 Authentic documents produced either by the chancery or by the beneficiary:

II.14.1.1 Ch 968 (Farrer): This charter, which is likely to date from 1033, records a grant of 43 hides at Patrington, Yorkshire, by King Cnut to Archbishop Ælfric of York. Even though the extant records of the text only date from the fourteenth century and later (see the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 968, and Laing 1993: 156–57), there is general consensus that the text represents an authentic charter. It may have been drafted in York (see Keynes 1994: 51).

II.14.1.2 Ch 969 (Kem 1318): This text, which the *Electronic Sawyer* (no. 969) dates to 1033, records a grant of land in Horton, Dorset, by Cnut. Keynes (Keynes 1994: 52, n. 50) hypothesizes that this may be a regional production from Sherborne, Dorset.

II.14.1.3 Ch 985 (Harm 26): This writ of Cnut declaring that he has confirmed the liberties of Christ Church, Canterbury, could be dated to 1017 x 1020 (see Harmer 1989: 446).

II.14.1.4 Ch 986 (Harm 28): This writ by Cnut declaring that he has granted judicial and financial rights to Archbishop Æthelnoth of Canterbury can be assigned to 1020 (Harmer 1989: 449). On the relationship between this writ and Wulfstan's language, see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 237–39.

II.14.1.5 Ch 987 (Harm 29): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 450) assigns this writ by Cnut in favour of Archbishop Æthelnoth of Canterbury to 1035.

II.14.1.6 LawCn 1020: Keynes (Keynes 1986: 96) explains the multiple authorship of Cnut's letter from 1020 as it stands: 'One might suggest, therefore, that chs. 1–13 preserve the text of Cnut's letter substantially as issued, and that chs. 14–20 were added by Wulfstan himself'. Thus,

while part of the text can be incorporated into the Wulfstanian canon (see below, II.257.13), the initial part has to be treated separately from it.

II.14.2 Spurious documents and documents whose language has been somewhat altered:

II.14.2.1 Ch 951 (Davidson): Even though Davidson thought this document, purporting to be a confirmation by King Cnut of a grant of land to Bishop Burhwold of Exeter, to be authentic (Davidson 1883: 285–87), later commentators have doubted its authenticity. Keynes (Keynes 1994: 52 and n. 51) indicates that, although the document is spurious, its witness list derives from an authentic text. Any fabrication of the text would have taken place by the end of the eleventh century; Chaplais (Chaplais 1981: 21–22) explains that the script of its oldest witness is not likely to be older than the third quarter of the eleventh century.

II.14.2.2 Ch 976 (Kem 753): As noted by Harmer (Harmer 1989: 382), there is no way of knowing whether this document, which purports to record a grant of privileges by Cnut to the Old Minster, Winchester, confirmed by Edward in Ch 1151 (Harm 109) (on which see below, II.15.1.34), is authentic or a later fabrication in association with the latter. Were the text original, it could be attributed to 1035 (see Finberg 1964: 63).

II.14.2.3 Ch 981 (Rob 85): Robertson explains that it is ‘impossible to accept the charter in its present form as genuine’ (Robertson 1939: 417). Thus, this grant of lands supposedly by King Cnut to Christ Church, Canterbury, cannot be associated with 1032, the date entered as an endorsement in a thirteenth-century hand on London, British Library, MS Stowe Charter 40. The text could have been put together during the first or the second half of the eleventh century, with the date of Stowe Charter 40, its earliest manuscript (late eleventh century), acting as the *terminus ad quem*.

II.14.2.4 Ch 992 (Harm 53): Harmer concludes her discussion on the authenticity of this writ, where Cnut declares that his priests of St Paul’s, London, will have judicial and financial rights as fully as they ever had in any king’s day, saying that ‘this text may actually represent an authentic writ of Cnut. To what extent it may have been altered and tampered with cannot be determined’ (Harmer 1989: 240). It is therefore not clear whether the wording of the extant text should be attributed to the first half of the eleventh century or to a later date. The text was recorded in

the twelfth century in the now lost Liber B of the Dean and Chapter of St Paul's (see Harmer 1989: 53), and this provides us with a *terminus ad quem* for its composition.

Please note that, given the uncertainty about the date of these texts and their association with Cnut, they are attributed here to Group 4 for the sake of simplicity.

II.15 Ch ECf: The Norse-derived terms recorded in the following documents can be grouped together as representing the language of Edward the Confessor's secretariat (see above, II.13):<sup>5</sup>

II.15.1 Authentic documents produced either by the chancery or by the beneficiary:

II.15.1.1 Ch 1032 (Rob 120): This grant of privileges by King Edward to Horton Abbey, Dorset, may be an eleventh-century adaptation of Ch 333 (Rob 11), possibly drafted locally (see O'Donovan 1988: xxx, lix–lxii). It may, however, also be an original document, which could be dated to 1061 (see O'Donovan 1988: 77).

II.15.1.2 Ch 1063 (Harm 1): Even though this text, where King Edward grants some privileges (regarding land probably in Abbotsbury, Dorset) to one of his housecarls, is first recorded in PRO Charter Roll 8 Edw. II, m. 3, no. 5, Harmer (Harmer 1989: 117 and 119–20) argues in favour of its authenticity. She dates the grant to 1053 x 1058 (Harmer 1989: 425).

II.15.1.3 Ch 1064 (Harm 2): This text, in which King Edward declares that a certain Tole has his permission to bequeath land to St Peter's, Abbotsbury (Dorset), shares some features with Ch 1063 (Harm 1): its attestation and its suggested authenticity (see above, II.15.1.2). Harmer (Harmer 1989: 427) dates this text to 1058 x 1066.

II.15.1.4 Ch 1067 (Harm 7): This writ, which proclaims that King Edward has given permission to Archbishop Ealdred of York to draw up a *privilegium* for all the lands belonging to St John's Minster at Beverly, is dated to 1060 x 1065 by Harmer (Harmer 1989: 432).

II.15.1.5 Ch 1071 (Harm 11): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 438) dates this writ from Edward the Confessor to the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds to 1044 x 1065.

<sup>5</sup> On the existence of a royal secretariat during the reigns of Edward the Confessor and William the Conqueror, see Keynes 1988.

II.15.1.6 Ch 1072 (Harm 12): The same description as for Ch 1071 (Harm 11) is appropriate for this text (see above, II.15.1.5).

II.15.1.7 Ch 1073 (Harm 13): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 438) dates this writ in favour of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds to 1044 x 1047.

II.15.1.8 Ch 1074 (Harm 14): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 438) dates this writ in favour of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds to 1044 x 1047, albeit probably 1046 x 1047.

II.15.1.9 Ch 1075 (Harm 15): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 439) assigns this document from King Edward to the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds to 1051.

II.15.1.10 Ch 1076 (Harm 16): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 440) dates this writ in favour of Queen Ælfgifu (Emma of Normandy) regarding some lands previously in the possession of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds to 1051 x 1052. It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.15.1.11 Ch 1077 (Harm 17): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 440) dates this writ in favour of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds to 1052 or 1053 x 1057, although she lends more support to the former. It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.15.1.12 Ch 1079 (Harm 19): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 442) dates this document from King Edward to the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds to 1051 x 1052 or 1053 x 1057. It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.15.1.13 Ch 1080 (Harm 20): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 442) assigns to this document in favour of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds the same date as to Ch 1079 (Harm 19) (see above, II.15.1.12). It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.15.1.14 Ch 1081 (Harm 21): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 443) dates this document associated with the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds and Ely to 1051 x 1052 or 1053 x 1057. It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.15.1.15 Ch 1082 (Harm 22): The same comments as for Ch 1079 (Harm 19) apply for this text (see above, II.15.1.12).



II.15.1.16 Ch 1083 (Harm 23): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 443) dates this writ from King Edward to the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds to 1065 x 1066. It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.15.1.17 Ch 1084 (Harm 24): The same comments as for Ch 1083 (Harm 23) apply for this text (see above, II.15.1.16).

II.15.1.18 Ch 1085 (Harm 25): The same comments as for Ch 1083 (Harm 23) apply for this text (see above, II.15.1.16).

II.15.1.19 Ch 1088 (Harm 33): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 173) doubts the authenticity of this document from King Edward to Archbishop Stigand and the community at Christ Church, Canterbury, as it stands. However, she accepts that the first three lines of the writ (where OE *eorl* is recorded) 'belong to an authentic writ of the Confessor for Archbishop Stigand produced by the clerks of the king's secretariat' (cp. Keynes 1988: 215). She dates these lines to 1052 x 1066 (Harmer 1989: 452). She explains that the rest of the text is a composite and cannot therefore be dated with any certainty, although there is a clear possibility that the text relies on an authentic writ (see Harmer 1989: 173). A *terminus ad quem* is provided by its record in London, British Library, MS Campbell Charter xxi.5 in a hand of the late eleventh or early twelfth century (see Harmer 1989: 452: 452 and Sharpe 2003: 287). For a date when the text may have been put together, see below, II.17.2.3.

II.15.1.20 Ch 1090 (Harm 35): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 454) dates this writ from Edward the Confessor to Christ Church, Canterbury, to 1053 x 1061.

II.15.1.21 Ch 1091 (Harm 38): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 457) dates this writ by Edward the Confessor to St Augustine's, Canterbury, to 1042 x 1044, or 1048 x 1050.

II.15.1.22 Ch 1092 (Harm 39): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 458) dates this writ by Edward the Confessor to St Augustine's, Canterbury, to 1053 x 1066.

II.15.1.23 Ch 1100 (Harm 47): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 464) dates this document, announcing the appointment of Wulfric to the office of Abbot of Ely, to 1045 x 1066, or 1055 x 1066.

II.15.1.24 Ch 1103 (Harm 51): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 467) dates this writ by Edward in favour of his men in the gild of English *cnihtas* to 1042 x 1044.

II.15.1.25 Ch 1105 (Harm 55): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 470) dates this writ, declaring a grant of land in Oxford by Edward to the monastery of Saint-Denis, near Paris, to 1053 x 1057.

II.15.1.26 Ch 1113 (Harm 66): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 488) dates this writ by Edward in favour of Bishop Giso of Wells to 1061 x 1066.

II.15.1.27 Ch 1125 (Harm 81): Harmer suggests that this document in favour of Abbot Edwin of Westminster is likely to be a 'slightly later copy of an original writ' (Harmer 1989: 505). She explains that the document can be dated to 1049 x 1066.

II.15.1.28 Ch 1126 (Harm 82): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 318–19 and 505) explains that, even though the authenticity of this writ by the Confessor to St Peter's, Westminster, is not beyond doubt, the document is likely to be a later copy of an authentic writ. One of the extant copies dates from the second half of the eleventh century, which offers a *terminus ad quem* for any possible alterations to the text. Harmer (Harmer 1989: 505) would date the original text of this document to 1042 x 1066.

II.15.1.29 Ch 1127 (Harm 83): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 319) explains that, if Ch 1126 (Harm 82) is accepted as authentic (see above, II.15.1.28), there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of this document in favour of the same beneficiary. She assigns it to the same date as its companion document (Harmer 1989: 506).

II.15.1.30 Ch 1132 (Harm 88): Harmer suggests that this document in favour of Westminster Abbey is likely to be a '(later) copy of an authentic writ by King Edward' (Harmer 1989: 321). She dates the text to 1051 x 1066 or, more narrowly, 1057 x 1066 (Harmer 1989: 510).

II.15.1.31 Ch 1139 (Harm 95): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 515) dates this writ in favour of Westminster Abbey to 1065 x 1066.

II.15.1.32 Ch 1140 (Harm 96): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 516) dates this writ in favour of Westminster Abbey to 1062 x 1066.

II.15.1.33 Ch 1141 (Harm 97): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 328) explains that this document in favour of Westminster Abbey is likely to be a late eleventh-century copy of an authentic writ by the Confessor. She explains that the original document cannot be dated more narrowly than to 1042 x 1066.

II.15.1.34 Ch 1151 (Harm 109): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 382) suggests that there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of this document, a confirmation by Edward the Confessor of the privileges to the Old Minster, Winchester, supposedly granted by Cnut in Ch 979 (Kem

753). Harmer (Harmer 1989: 397) dates the document to 1042 x 1047. However, there is no way of knowing whether Ch 979 (Kem 753) is authentic or is a later fabrication in association with Ch 1151 (Harm 109), as noted by Harmer (Harmer 1989: 382). Were the text original, it could be attributed to 1035 (see Finberg 1964: 63).

II.15.1.35 Ch 1153 (Harm 111): Harmer explains that this writ in favour of the Old Minster, Winchester, 'seems to be authentic, except for the final clause relating to Hayling' (Harmer 1989: 382). She dates the original document to 1052 x 1053 (Harmer 1989: 526).

II.15.1.36 Ch 1156 (Harm 115): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 528) dates this document, declaring that Edward has granted the see of Worcester to Wulfstan (not to be confused with Archbishop Wulfstan II of York, on whose works see below, II.257), to 1062.

II.15.1.37 Ch 1161 (Harm 120): Harmer dates this document, declaring that Edward has granted Ealdred, the 'deacon' of Archbishop Ealdred of York, the Minster at Axminster, Devon, to 1060 x 1066 (Harmer 1989: 530).

II.15.1.38 Ch 1162 (Harm in Clemoes): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 93–94, 101) dates this writ of King Edward in favour of his clerks at Bromfield, Shropshire, to 1060 x 1061.

II.15.1.39 Ch 1240 (Harm 70): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 490) dates this document of Queen Edith, Edward's wife, in favour of Bishop Giso of Wells to 1061 x 1066.

II.15.2 Spurious documents and documents whose language has been somewhat altered:

II.15.2.1 Ch 1045 (Kem 895): It is difficult to date this spurious document, which purports to record a confirmation and grant of privileges to the Abbey of St Edmunds by Edward the Confessor (see Harmer 1989: 141, n. 2). However, Sharpe (Sharpe 2003: 256) suggests that it is likely to date from the 1070s.

II.15.2.2 Ch 1047 (Rob 95): The authenticity of this grant of lands by King Edward the Confessor to Christ Church, Canterbury, is not beyond doubt; however, even if it is not authentic in its extant form, it is likely to have an authentic basis (see Harmer 1989: 175 n. 5). Robertson (Robertson 1939: 427) says that the text gives the impression of having been drawn up soon after the Confessor's accession in 1042. Most of the text, including the use of OE *eorl*, was recorded in the late eleventh century in London, British Library, MS Cotton Claudius A.iii (see Ker

1990: no. 185, art. f), which provides us with a *terminus ad quem* for the compilation of the text as it stands. It is, therefore, not clear whether the formulaic use of OE *eorl* in the text should be associated with the first or the second half of the eleventh century.

II.15.2.3 Ch 1065 (Harm 4): Harmer explains that this document in favour of St Mary's Minster at Abingdon is likely to represent an 'alteration and interpolation of a genuine writ' issued by King Edward (Harmer 1989: 125). She dates the original document on which this text is said to rely to 1052 x 1066 (Harmer 1989: 428).

II.15.2.4 Ch 1066 (Harm 5): This writ, purporting to record a grant by Edward the Confessor to Abbot Ordric and the community at Abingdon, is generally considered to be spurious; however, the document may rely on an authentic original (see Harmer 1989: 125–31, and Kelly 2000–01: no. 149). Harmer (Harmer 1989: 429) suggests that the transaction recorded in the text can be dated to 1053 x 1055, or 1058 x 1066.

II.15.2.5 Ch 1078 (Harm 18): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 441) dates this document in favour of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds to 1052, or 1053 x 1057. She accepts that the document is likely to be a copy of an authentic writ; however, she points out that the language has 'been extensively modernised' (Harmer 1989: 148). It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.15.2.6 Ch 1089 (Harm 34): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 173–75 and 452) doubts the authenticity of this document in favour of Christ Church, Canterbury, as it stands. Were the writ authentic, she would date it to 1052 x 1066 (Harmer 1989: 452). The *terminus ad quem* for the manipulation of the text is dictated by its record in Canterbury, Dean and Chapter Library, MS C.3 in a hand from c. 1100 (see Harmer 1989: 452). The address formula is clearly associated with five later documents in favour of successive archbishops of Canterbury and the monks of Christ Church: Ch IHen (Birch), which Pelteret (Pelteret 1990: 73, no. 46) would date to 1107(?); Ch IHen (PRO1907 10), which Pelteret (Pelteret 1990: 74–75, no. 48) would date to 1123; Ch IHen (Somner), which Pelteret (Pelteret 1990: 74, no. 47) would date after 29 June 1114; Ch Steph (PRO1912 2), which Pelteret (Pelteret 1990: 76–77, no. 50) would date to 1138 x 1154; and Ch IIHen (PRO1912 3), which Pelteret (Pelteret 1990: 80–81, no. 54) would date to 1154 x 1161, or 1172 x 1189. Harmer (Harmer 1989: 174–75) explains that their authenticity

is not beyond doubt. It is possible that they were copied in the monastery from previous documents with the necessary change of names and then submitted to the king for the seal. It is, however, also possible that the documents are later copies (or forgeries) to which seals have been fraudulently attached. Keynes (Keynes 1988: 218 n. 198) does not express any doubts about their authenticity, though. In either case, the use of OE *eorl* in these documents, albeit indicating familiarity with the term in the twelfth century (see below, II.16), should be associated with Ch 1089 (Harm 34). Rec 6.10 (Stanley), a document purporting to date from William's time, should also be associated with these documents as it shares a very similar list of privileges.

II.15.2.7 Ch 1093 (Harm 40): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 207–08 and 459) explains that this document, purporting to record a grant of lands by King Edward to Chertsey Abbey in Surrey, cannot be accepted as authentic as it stands, even though it may rely on an authentic text which could have been issued between 1053 and 1066. The fact that the text was written down in London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius A.xiii in the second half of the thirteenth century (see Harmer 1989: 459, and Laing 1993: 84) is the only reliable *terminus ad quem* for the composition of this text.

II.15.2.8 Ch 1094 (Harm 41): Harmer suggests that this document is an 'improved and embellished version' of Ch 1093 (Harm 40) (Harmer 1989: 206–07) (see above, II.15.2.7).

II.15.2.9 Ch 1095 (Harm 42): According to Harmer, this document in favour of Chertsey Abbey 'is not an unaltered copy of an authentic writ of the Confessor, but one that has been retouched and improved by a later hand' (Harmer 1989: 205), the reference to the privileges defined by OE *grīðbryce* and *hāmsōcn* being one of the 'improvements' (see Harmer 1989: 204). The authentic text the writ may be based on could have been issued between 1058 and 1066 (see Harmer 1989: 460). Given that the privileges presented in this document are basically the same as in the previous two, the use of OE *grīðbryce* and *hāmsōcn* in the three of them is unlikely to have developed independently (see above, II.15.2.7–8).

II.15.2.10 Ch 1098 (Harm 45): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 215–18) explains that this charter in favour of Coventry Minster, purporting to date from the reign of Edward the Confessor, is likely to originate instead from the late eleventh century, i.e. not much before it was copied

at the end of the eleventh century into London, British Library, MS Add. Charter 28,657 (see Harmer 1989: 462).

II.15.2.11 Ch 1099 (Harm in Clemoes): Harmer (Harmer 1959: 90, 98, and 100) explains that this document in favour of Leofwine, Abbot of Coventry, can be dated to 1041 x 1053, and that, even though it goes back to an authentic document, the extant text is a late thirteenth- or early fourteenth-century copy with slightly modernized language.

II.15.2.12 Ch 1104 (Harm 54): The relationship between this writ in favour of St Paul's, London, dated to 1042 x 1066 by Harmer (Harmer 1989: 242), and Ch 945 (Harm 52), supposedly a writ by King Æthelred in favour of the same house, is complex because they are virtually identical. As pointed out by Harmer (Harmer 1989: 236–37), it is difficult to establish which is the original text. Scholars tend to consider that the document purporting to date from Æthelred's time may be a copy from the Conqueror's text, which Harmer describes as 'an authentic writ of the Confessor [which] may have been tampered with' (Harmer 1989: 238).

II.15.2.13 Ch 1109 (Harm 61): This document purports to record a grant of judicial and financial rights by Edward to Ramsey Abbey. Harmer (Harmer 1989: 474) explains that the document as it stands cannot be authentic because the addresses would date it to 1057/58 x 1066, while the list of witnesses points rather to 1045 x 1053.

II.15.2.14 Ch 1110 (Harm 62): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 478–79) explains that this writ, which declares that Edward has confirmed an agreement between the Abbots of Ramsey and Peterborough, is spurious. The address may have been taken from an authentic writ issued at some point between 1055 and 1065, while the list of witnesses suggests the period 1052 x 1066.

II.15.2.15 Ch 1111 (Harm 64): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 272 and 487) dates this document in favour of Bishop Giso of Wells to 1060 x 1061 and explains that the text represents a modernized copy of an authentic original.

II.15.2.16 Ch 1112 (Harm 65): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 272 and 487) dates this document in favour of Bishop Giso of Wells to 1061 x 1066 and explains that, as in the previous case, the extant text represents a modernized copy of an authentic original.

II.15.2.17 Ch 1114 (Harm 67): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 273) suggests that this document in favour of Bishop Giso of Wells is a copy of Ch 1113 (Harm 66) (see above, II.15.1.26).

II.15.2.18 Ch 1115 (Harm 68): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 274 and 489) explains that this document in favour of Bishop Giso of Wells is a modernized copy of an authentic writ which could be dated to 1061 x 1066.

II.15.2.19 Ch 1116 (Harm 69): The same comments as for Ch 1115 (Harm 68) are applicable for this text (see above, II.15.2.18).

II.15.2.20 Ch 1120 (Harm 76): Harmer explains that, were this document in favour of Westminster Abbey authentic, it could be dated to 1042 x 1050. However, 'there is a possibility that this writ as a whole is spurious' (Harmer 1989: 496). The text is recorded in the late eleventh century (see Harmer 1989: 45), which offers a *terminus ad quem* for the likely fabrication of this document.<sup>6</sup>

II.15.2.21 Ch 1121 (Harm 77): Harmer concludes with regard to the authenticity of this writ by King Edward to Westminster Abbey that 'whether or not the writ [...] had a substantial basis in an authentic writ of the Confessor, the writ in the form in which it has come down to us has been embellished and enlarged' (Harmer 1989: 309). The extant copy may have been written down as late as the early twelfth century, which provides us with a *terminus ad quem* for any 'lexical embellishment' that the text may have undergone. Harmer (Harmer 1989: 497) attributes the original on which the text may rely to 1044 x 1051. It is therefore not clear whether the Norse-derived vocabulary in the text should be attributed to the first or the second half of the eleventh century (or to the early twelfth century).

II.15.2.22 Ch 1122 (Harm 78): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 499) explains that, if this writ in favour of Westminster Abbey were authentic, it should be dated to 1045 x 1049. However, she hypothesizes that it is likely to be a post-Conquest fabrication (Harmer 1989: 313–15).

II.15.2.23 Ch 1123 (Harm 79): The authenticity of this writ in favour of Westminster Abbey is not beyond doubt (see Harmer 1989: 315–16). Harmer would date the document, if it were authentic, to 1049.

II.15.2.24 Ch 1124 (Harm 80): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 316–18) explains that this document in favour of Westminster Abbey is spurious.

<sup>6</sup> On the fabrications of Westminster Abbey, see Sullivan 1994: 60–63. Sullivan explains that most of the forgeries seem to have been made in two waves: (1) *c.* 1071, when Edwin, the last Anglo-Saxon abbot of the Abbey, died; and (2) *c.* 1130 x 1160, this being the most important wave.



However, the address, where Earls Gyrth and Harold are mentioned, and the final part of the document, where OE *lagu* appears, could be authentic, and could be dated to 1047 x 1065.

II.15.2.25 Ch 1128 (Harm 84): Harmer suggests that this document in favour of Westminster Abbey is likely to represent 'a (possibly improved and modernised copy of) a writ of King Edward' (Harmer 1989: 299). She dates the original document to 1052 x 1053 (Harmer 1989: 506).

II.15.2.26 Ch 1129 (Harm 85): Harmer suggests that this document in favour of Westminster Abbey is likely to represent 'an authentic writ of Edward, probably altered and expanded' (Harmer 1989: 507). She would date the original writ to 1053 x 1066.

II.15.2.27 Ch 1130 (Harm 86): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 320) suggests that this document in favour of Westminster Abbey is likely to be a slightly altered copy of an original writ by the Confessor. The original writ on which it relies could be dated to 1051 x 1066 or, more narrowly, to 1057 x 1066.

II.15.2.28 Ch 1133 (Harm 89): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 321–22) suggests that the writ is an expanded version of Ch 1132 (Harm 88), on which see above, II.15.1.30.

II.15.2.29 Ch 1134 (Harm 90): Harmer suggests that this writ in favour of Westminster Abbey is 'a close copy, with only slight alterations in linguistic forms, of an authentic writ of King Edward the Confessor' (Harmer 1989: 323). The text is recorded in a copy from the late eleventh century (Harmer 1989: 511), which provides us with a *terminus ad quem* for the alterations. Harmer (Harmer 1989: 511) would date the original writ on which the document is likely to rely to 1053 x 1066, or possibly 1057 x 1066.

II.15.2.30 Ch 1135 (Harm 91): Harmer suggests that this writ in favour of Westminster Abbey 'may possibly represent an authentic writ by King Edward, but if so the text has been embellished and "improved"' (Harmer 1989: 511). She would date the authentic text on which it may rely to 1053 x 1066 or, possibly, to 1057 x 1066.

II.15.2.31 Ch 1136 (Harm 92): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 521) explains that the authenticity of this document in favour of Westminster Abbey is doubtful. Were the writ authentic, she would date it to 1057 x 1066.

II.15.2.32 Ch 1137 (Harm 93): The situation of this document, which records the grant of a piece of land to Westminster Abbey which may be datable to 1058 x 1066 (see Harmer 1989: 512–13), is similar to

that of Ch 1121 (Harm 77) (see above, II.15.2.21). She states that its authenticity 'is more than doubtful' (Harmer 1989: 303). The fact that the text was copied *c.* 1100 (Harmer 1989: 512) provides us with a *terminus ad quem* for the composition of this document. On the reference to Tostig as *eorl*, see Harmer (Harmer 1989: 575–76).

II.15.2.33 Ch 1142 (Harm 98): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 518) explains that this writ in favour of Westminster Abbey may represent an authentic writ issued sometime in the period 1053 x 1066; however, as it stands, it is likely to have undergone some alteration and expansion. Its record in a late eleventh-century hand (see Harmer 1989: 517) provides us with a *terminus ad quem* for the alterations.

II.15.2.34 Ch 1143 (Harm 99): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 330) suggests that the text represents a modernized copy of an authentic writ in favour of Westminster Abbey by Edward the Confessor. The original document cannot be dated more narrowly than during the years of his reign (see Harmer 1989: 519).

II.15.2.35 Ch 1144 (Harm 100): Harmer explains that it is hard to believe that this writ is independent from Ch 1143 (Harm 99) (see above, II.15.2.34); she hypothesizes that it 'may have been produced in the abbey after the Conquest to meet some emergency which had not been foreseen at the time when the first writ (no. 99) was issued' (Harmer 1989: 331).

II.15.2.36 Ch 1146 (Harm 102): Harmer suggests that this document in favour of Westminster Abbey may represent an authentic document issued by Edward towards 1066; however, as it stands, it is likely to have undergone 'improvement and embellishment at the hands of the monks of Westminster' (Harmer 1989: 313).

II.15.2.37 Ch 1147 (Harm 103): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 522) dates this document in favour of Westminster Abbey to 1065 x 1066; its authenticity is not beyond doubt (see Harmer 1989: 522: 334–36). The use of OE *eorl* in this document should be associated with its appearance in Ch 1139 (Harm 95), on which see above, II.15.1.31.

II.15.2.38 Ch 1148 (Harm 104): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 336–37) suggests that this document in favour of Westminster Abbey is likely to represent a mixture of authentic and spurious material. One of the issues which raises her suspicion is the combination of OE *mundbryce* and *gridbryce* because authentic pre-Conquest documents do not join them (see Harmer 1989: 80). She attributes to this document the same

date as to Ch 1147 (Harm 103), on which see above, II.15.2.37 (Harmer 1989: 523).

II.15.2.39 Ch 1149 (Harm 105) and Ch 1150 (Harm 106): Harmer explains that these documents, purporting to record a grant of full freedom upon all lands belonging to Westminster Abbey, 'seem to contain authentic material, but it is likely that they have been "worked over" and it is even possible that this process has resulted in the production from one original writ of King Edward of two very similar texts' (Harmer 1989: 334). Harmer (Harmer 1989: 523) would date a possible original on which Ch 1149 (Harm 105) may rely to 1051 x 1066, while she suggests 1065 x 1066 as the possible date during which the original behind the second document could have been issued.

II.15.2.40 Ch 1152 (Harm 110): Harmer suggests that this document is an 'improved and embellished version made at Winchester' (Harmer 1989: 381) of Ch 1151 (Harm 109), on which see above, II.15.1.34.

II.15.2.41 Ch 1154 (Harm 112): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 526) explains that this document in favour of the Old Minster, Winchester, is of dubious authenticity. Were the text authentic, she would date it to 1053 x 1056.

II.15.2.42 Ch 1155 (Harm 114): Harmer explains that this document in favour of St Mary of Wolverhampton 'cannot be authentic in its present form, and may be an entire fabrication' from the post-Conquest period by 'someone who was in some degree acquainted with the structures and formulas of the Anglo-Saxon writ, but was unpractised in the writing of Old English' (Harmer 1989: 403 and 406).

II.15.2.43 Ch 1157 (Harm 116): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 409) explains that this Worcester writ, which she attributes to 1062, presents a 'slightly modernised copy of an authentic writ of King Edward' (Harmer 1989: 528).

II.15.2.44 Ch 1158 (Harm 117): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 410 and 529) suggests that this document in favour of Bishop Wulfstan II of Worcester is a modernized copy of an authentic document issued in 1062.

II.15.2.45 Ch 1159 (Harm 118): Harmer describes this document in favour of Archbishop Ealdred of York as 'a (slightly modernised) copy of an authentic writ of King Edward' (Harmer 1989: 413). She dates this document to 1060 x 1066 (Harmer 1989: 529).

II.16 Ch IHen: Besides Ch IHen (Birch), Ch IHen (PRO1907 10) and Ch IHen (Somner) (on which see above, II.15.2.6) and Ch IHen (Gibbs 23) (on which see below, II.17.1.16), various documents could be said to represent the language of Henry I's secretariat.

II.16.1 Ch IHen (BLAdd 29436): Pelteret (Pelteret 1990: 72–73, no. 45) dates this document in favour of St Peter's, Winchester, to 1103 (c. 13 January). On the manuscript where the document is recorded, see Laing (Laing 1993: 63).

II.16.2 Ch IHen (Clarke): Pelteret (Pelteret 1990: 72, no. 44) dates this document in favour of the men of Archbishop Anselm of Canterbury to 1100 x 1101.

II.17 Ch IWm: The Norse-derived terms recorded in the following documents can be grouped together as representing the language of William the Conqueror's secretariat (see above, II.13):

II.17.1 Authentic documents produced either by the chancery or by the beneficiary:

II.17.1.1 Ch IWm (BLAdd 29436): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 339) dates this writ in favour of St Peter's, Winchester, to 1070 x 1087, possibly soon after 1070.

II.17.1.2 Ch IWm (Davis 5): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 36) explains that this document in favour of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds is closely related to Ch 1085 (Harm 25) (on which see above, II.15.1.18), and dates it to 1066 x 1070. Given that the text simply seems to make the appropriate replacements of names in the salutation formula, the use of OE *eorl* in the text can be associated with that in Ch 1085 (Harm 25).

II.17.1.3 Ch IWm (Davis 6): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 37) dates this document in favour of Abbot Baldwin of Bury St Edmunds to 1066 x 1070. Given that the text simply seems to make the appropriate replacements of names in the salutation formula, the use of OE *eorl* in the text can be associated with that in Ch 1084 (Harm 24), on which see above, II.15.1.17. The salutation formula repeats verbatim that in Ch IWm (Davis 5), on which see above, II.17.1.2.

II.17.1.4 Ch IWm (Davis 7): Bates explains that this document in favour of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds is very close to Ch 1084 (Harm 24), on which see above, II.15.1.17, which 'suggests that the Edward writ was brought for confirmation early in William's reign, and redrafted to meet

new circumstances' (Bates 1998: no. 38). Given that the text simply seems to make the appropriate replacements of names in the salutation formula, the use of OE *eorl* in the text can be associated with that in Ch 1084 (Harm 24).

II.17.1.5 Ch IWm (Douglas 6): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 34) dates this document in favour of Abbot Baldwin of Bury St Edmunds to 1066 x 1087, but probably shortly after 1066.

II.17.1.6 Ch IWm (Dugdale 10): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 98) explains that this writ in favour of Abbot Wulfwold of Bath and Chertsey is likely to represent the Chertsey text of a writ dealing with the two abbeys held by Wulfwold (the Bath text is probably Ch IWm (Hunt 2), on which see below, II.17.1.18). Bates would date the text to 1066 x 1084, probably to 1066 x c. 1070.

II.17.1.7 Ch IWm (Dugdale 35): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 291) dates this writ in favour of the Abbey of Westminster to 1066 x 1070.

II.17.1.8 Ch IWm (Dugdale 39W): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 292) dates this writ in favour of Westminster Abbey to 1066 x 1071. The text records the same grant as Ch 1140 (Harm 96), on which see above, II.15.1.32.

II.17.1.9 Ch IWm (Dugdale 40): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 295) dates this writ in favour of Westminster Abbey to 1066 x 1069. OE *eorl* is used in association with the Norman William fitz Osbern. It is not totally clear whether he was an earl; he has been identified as Earl of Herefordshire (West 1959: 632), but Lewis (C. P. Lewis 1991: 217) has challenged that identification.

II.17.1.10 Ch IWm (Farrer 12): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 351) dates this writ in favour of Archbishop Ealdred of York to 1066 x 1069.

II.17.1.11 Ch IWm (Farrer 89): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 31) dates this writ in favour of St John of Beverley, Yorkshire, to 1066 x 1069. Interestingly, Bates does not rule out that the text may have been drafted and written by a scribe of the beneficiary, which could also help to explain the retention of the Norse diphthong in OE *caupland*.

II.17.1.12 Ch IWm (Galbraith 2): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 338) dates this writ in favour of Bishop Walchelin of Winchester to 1070 x 1097, probably to c. 1070.

II.17.1.13 Ch IWm (Galbraith 3): This writ is identical to Ch IWm (Galbraith 2), on which see above, II.17.1.12, with the only difference that it is restricted in scope to Hampshire. On its relationship with the previous charter, see Bates (Bates 1998: no. 337).

II.17.1.14 Ch IWm (Gibbs 3): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 194) dates this writ in favour of the church of St Paul's, London, to 1066 x 1087 (perhaps 1066 x c. 1070).

II.17.1.15 Ch IWm (Gibbs 5): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 189) dates this writ in favour of Bishop Maurice of London to 1085 x 1087, probably 1085 x 1086. The use of OE *lagu* in the text could be associated with that in two other writs in favour of St Paul's, London, viz. Ch 945 (Harm 52) and Ch 1104 (Harm 54) (see above, II.15.2.12); however, a similar structure is found in Ch IWm (BLAdd 29436), which is not associated with St Paul's. Therefore, despite the similarity with previous documents, the use of OE *lagu* is included in 3.3 and I.54.7 in Group 6, rather than being presented together with the aforementioned documents.

II.17.1.16 Ch IWm (Gibbs 9) = Ch IWm (PRO1908 2): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 185) dates this document in favour of St Paul's cathedral in London to 1072 x 1078, or to 1070 x 1078. He explains that Ch IHen (Gibbs 23), from 25 December 1100, reproduces the Old English passage of William's document very closely.

II.17.1.17 Ch IWm (Hardwick): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 80) explains that this text is an almost verbatim copy of Ch 1091 (Harm 38), on which see above, II.15.1.21, with the necessary change of names. This suggests that 'the abbey simply asked William to confirm the text of an earlier writ', something which is likely to have happened soon after his accession. The greeting, however, does not coincide; therefore, as far as OE *eorl* is concerned, the text is treated independently from Edward's writ.

II.17.1.18 Ch IWm (Hunt 2): As pointed out above, II.17.1.6, this text is likely to represent the Bath equivalent of Ch IWm (Dugdale 10). Bates hypothesizes that the text may have been 'produced in a style determined by the abbey, and perhaps written by a scribe of the abbey' (Bates 1998: no. 12). He dates the text to 1066 x 1084, but probably 1066 x 1070. Interestingly, Ch IWm (Dugdale 10) has no reference to OE *gridbryce* or *hāmsōcn*.

II.17.1.19 Ch IWm (Phillipps 1): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 223) explains that this document, recording that some lands in Wiltshire are held by Regenbald, his priest, should be dated to 1066 x 1067 (cp. Keynes 1988: 211, and n. 152).

II.17.1.20 Ch IWm (PRO1908 2): see above, II.17.1.16.

II.17.1.21 Ch IWm (Robertson): Wormald explains that this document, William's 'London Charter', would have been issued 'within months, perhaps weeks' of the Conqueror's coronation (Wormald 1999: 398).

II.17.1.22 Ch IWm or IIWm (Salter): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 276) dates this document, where William notifies Archbishop Thomas of York and others that he has granted lands in Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire to the church of St Mary at Stow in Lincolnshire, to 1070 x April 1072.

II.17.1.23 Ch IWm (Stevenson): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 181) assigns this document in favour of the church of St Martin-le-Grand, London, to 1068.

II.17.1.24 LawWILad: This code, 'Regulations concerning exculpation', belongs to the reign of William the Conqueror (see Wormald 1999: 399). Given that it has the form of a writ and that it is likely to originate from William's secretariat, its language is associated with that of the other documents from the king's circle.

II.17.2 Spurious documents and documents whose language has been somewhat altered:

II.17.2.1 Ch IWm (Douglas 7): The authenticity of this writ in favour of the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds is not beyond doubt (see Bates 1998: no. 39). If the document were authentic, it should be dated to 1081, although it is recorded in an eleventh-century hand (see Bates 1998: no. 39). These dates provide us with the temporal space during which any possible fabrication would have taken place.

II.17.2.2 Ch IWm (Hunt 1): West (West 1959) has argued that this document is a slightly modernized copy of an original writ by William in favour of St Peter's, Bath, issued *c.* 1067. The address mentions 'Willelm eorl'. West (West 1959) would like to identify him with the Conqueror himself in his role of Duke of Normandy (cp. the Latin formula 'Willelmus rex Anglorum et dux Normanorum'). However, it is also possible that he should be identified as Earl William of Herefordshire (see C. P. Lewis 1991: 217, and Bates 1998: no. 11), on whom see above, II.17.1.9.

II.17.2.3 Ch IWm (PRO1907 3): Bates (Bates 1998: no. 66) suggests that this text in favour of Christ Church, Canterbury, may rely on an authentic writ. This authentic writ may have been retained in the first line, 'which is the start of a William I writ produced by a beneficiary's scribe early in the reign'. However, like Ch 1088 (Harm 33), on which see above, II.15.1.19, this writ seems to have been rewritten, possibly as late as the second quarter of the twelfth century, so as to bring the writ 'into line with the texts of the Henry I confirmations of Christ Church's privileges' (Bates 1998: no. 66).



II.18 Ch IIWm (PRO1906): Pelteret (Pelteret 1990: 70–72, no. 42) assigns this document by William II in favour of the Church of St Andrew the Apostle, Rochester, to 1088.

II.19 Ch Lambourn (RobAppI 5): Even though the late thirteenth-century copyist of this record of the dues to the church at Lambourn, Berkshire, attributed it to Cnut's time, Robertson (Robertson 1939: 490–91) explains that, in its current form, it should rather be attributed to the 1080s or 1090s.

II.20 Ch Odo (Loyd-Stenton): Lloyd and Stenton (Lloyd and Stenton 1950: 301) date this document, recording a grant of land by Odo, bishop of Bayeux and earl of Kent (see C. P. Lewis 1991: 217–18), to Christ Church, Canterbury, to 1071 x 1082.

II.21 Ch Peterbor (Rob 40): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 330) suggests that the transactions recorded in this composite text, which deals with sureties for Peterborough states, must fall between 963 and 992 (cp. Kelly 2009: 334–35). It is recorded in London, Society of Antiquaries, MS 60, the so-called *Liber Niger* of Peterborough, which should be attributed to the first half of the twelfth century (see Laing 1993: 118–19, and Kelly 2009: 86–88). These dates provide the timeframe for the composition of the text. However, given that Kelly (Kelly 2009: 88) explains that the scribe of the cartulary 'was a careful copyist, who was confident with Old English, and his texts of pre-Conquest diplomas are in general excellent', and that there is no reason to think that the scribe may have altered the original text, it is discussed in Chapter 3 together with other texts which are likely to have been composed in the late tenth century or early in the eleventh century.

II.22 Ch Taunton (RobAppI 4): Robertson (Robertson 1939) explains that this post-Conquest record of dues pertaining to Taunton was drawn up before the Domesday Book.

II.23 Ch Ulf (Whitelock 39): this will, which Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 207) dates to 1066 x 1068 and Kelly (Kelly 2009: 314–15) to 1066 x 1069 and which is only extant in Peterborough's *Liber Niger* (see above, II.21), records grants of lands, mainly in Lincolnshire, to various beneficiaries; the most important are the Abbey of Peterborough (St Peter at *Burg*), and Ealdred, archbishop of York.

II.24 Ch 255 (Birch 1331–33): this Crediton text purports to record an eighth-century grant of land by King Æthelheard to Crediton, Devon. While the document is generally considered to include genuine information, it seems to have been rewritten and somewhat altered when it was included in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Eng. Hist. A.2 in the second half of the eleventh century (see Edwards 1988: 255–58, and the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 255).

II.25 Ch 544 (Birch 883): Kelly (Kelly 2000–01: 175) dates this document in favour of Bishop Æthelmær of Abingdon to 949.

II.26 Ch 659 (Birch 1029): This document recording the grant of some lands in Nottinghamshire by King Eadwig to Bishop Oscytel of Dorchester (who later became Archbishop of York, 956–71) can be dated to c. 956 (see Hart 1975: no. 114). Hadley hypothesizes that this document may represent one of the means ‘by which the southern kings attempted to secure their control in the north, by granting land to magnates in the south who they then hoped would take control on their behalf further north’ (Hadley 2000b: 157). This text is associated with the non-Scandinavianized areas in 3.3.2 because, even though it mentions lands in Nottinghamshire, neither the grantor nor the beneficiary (i.e. the parties which are likely to have been involved in the drafting of the text) can be clearly associated with the Scandinavianized areas.

II.27 Ch 783 (Birch 1277): This charter for the benefit of Glastonbury Abbey is first recorded in the twelfth-century manuscript London, British Library, MS Royal 13 D.ii, which contains the works of William of Malmesbury (d. c. 1140). Even though it purports to date from Edgar’s reign, it is likely to be a forgery. Scott (Scott 1981: 31–32) suggests that it may be the work of William of Malmesbury (cp. S 250, and S 499).

II.28 Ch 898 (Kem 705): see above, II.13.1.1.

II.29 Ch 939 (Whitelock 16.2): see above, II.13.1.2.

II.30 Ch 945 (Harm 52): see above, II.15.2.12.

II.31 Ch 951 (Davidson): see above, II.14.2.1.

II.32 Ch 959 (Rob 82): This charter of Cnut to Christ Church, Canterbury, is very problematic. Brooks explains that ‘detailed analysis of the witnesses and

of the formulae of Cnut's Sandwich charter has not established any certain anachronisms or errors' (Brooks 1984: 293). Yet, given that there are no parallels of such an extensive grant before the Norman Conquest and that Christ Church is known to have been in dispute with St Augustine's over Sandwich after the Norman Conquest, it is likely to be the case that the text 'is a forgery of the 1070s and 1080s based upon a more restricted original diploma of 1023' (Brooks 1984: 294; cp. Napier and Stevenson 1895: 136–37; cf. Robertson 1939: 406, where the charter is suggested to be authentic). It is therefore not clear whether the use of OE *taperæx* in the text should be associated with the first or the second half of the eleventh century, but given the uncertainty surrounding this text and the fact that the term is not recorded in any other Cnutian document, it is dealt with separately from the texts associated with Cnut's secretariat (see above, II.14). What seems clear is that the occurrence of the term in the ChronF (Baker) 1029 and ChronA (Bately) 1031 should be associated with its attestation in the charter because the annals summarize the document. Baker (Baker 2000: xliii) suggests that the main scribe of the F-manuscript of the *Chronicle*, who worked in Christ Church at the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century (see Ker 1990: no. 148, and below, II.163.22), is likely to be responsible for writing the two annals.

II.33 Ch 968 (Farrer): see above, II.14.1.1.

II.34 Ch 969 (Kem 1318): see above, II.14.1.2.

II.35 Ch 976 (Kem 753): see above, II.14.2.2.

II.36 Ch 981 (Rob 85): see above, II.14.2.3.

II.37 Ch 985 (Harm 26): see above, II.14.1.3.

II.38 Ch 986 (Harm 28): see above, II.14.1.4.

II.39 Ch 987 (Harm 29): see above, II.14.1.5.

II.40 Ch 992 (Harm 53): see above, II.14.2.4.

II.41 Ch 1032 (Rob 120): see above, II.15.1.1.

II.42 Ch 1045 (Kem 895): see above, II.15.2.1.

II.43 Ch 1047 (Rob 95): see above, II.15.2.2.

II.44 Ch 1063 (Harm 1): see above, II.15.1.2.

II.45 Ch 1064 (Harm 2): see above, II.15.1.3.

II.46 Ch 1065 (Harm 4): see above, II.15.2.3.

II.47 Ch 1066 (Harm 5): see above, II.15.2.4.

II.48 Ch 1067 (Harm 7): see above, II.15.1.4.

II.49 Ch 1071 (Harm 11): see above, II.15.1.5.

II.50 Ch 1072 (Harm 12): see above, II.15.1.6.

II.51 Ch 1073 (Harm 13): see above, II.15.1.7.

II.52 Ch 1074 (Harm 14): see above, II.15.1.8.

II.53 Ch 1075 (Harm 15): see above, II.15.1.9.

II.54 Ch 1076 (Harm 16): see above, II.15.1.10.

II.55 Ch 1077 (Harm 17): see above, II.15.1.11.

II.56 Ch 1078 (Harm 18): see above, II.15.2.5.

II.57 Ch 1079 (Harm 19): see above, II.15.1.12.

II.58 Ch 1080 (Harm 20): see above, II.15.1.13.

II.59 Ch 1081 (Harm 21): see above, II.15.1.14.

II.60 Ch 1082 (Harm 22): see above, II.15.1.15.

II.61 Ch 1083 (Harm 23): see above, II.15.1.16.

II.62 Ch 1084 (Harm 24): see above, II.15.1.17.

- II.63 Ch 1085 (Harm 25): see above, II.15.1.18.
- II.64 Ch 1088 (Harm 33): see above, II.15.1.19.
- II.65 Ch 1089 (Harm 34): see above, II.15.2.6.
- II.66 Ch 1090 (Harm 35): see above, II.15.1.20.
- II.67 Ch 1091 (Harm 38): see above, II.15.1.21.
- II.68 Ch 1092 (Harm 39): see above, II.15.1.22.
- II.69 Ch 1093 (Harm 40): see above, II.15.2.7.
- II.70 Ch 1094 (Harm 41): see above, II.15.2.8.
- II.71 Ch 1095 (Harm 42): see above, II.15.2.9.
- II.72 Ch 1099 (Harm in Clemoes): see above, II.15.2.11.
- II.73 Ch 1100 (Harm 47): see above, II.15.1.23.
- II.74 Ch 1103 (Harm 51): see above, II.15.1.24.
- II.75 Ch 1104 (Harm 54): see above, II.15.2.12.
- II.76 Ch 1105 (Harm 55): see above, II.15.1.25.
- II.77 Ch 1109 (Harm 61): see above, II.15.2.13.
- II.78 Ch 1111 (Harm 64): see above, II.15.2.15.
- II.79 Ch 1112 (Harm 65): see above, II.15.2.16.
- II.80 Ch 1113 (Harm 66): see above, II.15.1.26.
- II.81 Ch 1114 (Harm 67): see above, II.15.2.17.
- II.82 Ch 1115 (Harm 68): see above, II.15.2.18.

- II.83 Ch 1116 (Harm 69): see above, II.15.2.19.
- II.84 Ch 1120 (Harm 76): see above, II.15.2.20.
- II.85 Ch 1121 (Harm 77): see above, II.15.2.21.
- II.86 Ch 1122 (Harm 78): see above, II.15.2.22.
- II.87 Ch 1123 (Harm 79): see above, II.15.2.23.
- II.88 Ch 1124 (Harm 80): see above, II.15.2.24.
- II.89 Ch 1125 (Harm 81): see above, II.15.1.27.
- II.90 Ch 1126 (Harm 82): see above, II.15.1.28.
- II.91 Ch 1127 (Harm 83): see above, II.15.1.29.
- II.92 Ch 1128 (Harm 84): see above, II.15.2.25.
- II.93 Ch 1129 (Harm 85): see above, II.15.2.26.
- II.94 Ch 1130 (Harm 86): see above, II.15.2.27.
- II.95 Ch 1132 (Harm 88): see above, II.15.1.30.
- II.96 Ch 1133 (Harm 89): see above, II.15.2.28.
- II.97 Ch 1134 (Harm 90): see above, II.15.2.29.
- II.98 Ch 1135 (Harm 91): see above, II.15.2.30.
- II.99 Ch 1136 (Harm 92): see above, II.15.2.31.
- II.100 Ch 1137 (Harm 93): see above, II.15.2.32.
- II.101 Ch 1139 (Harm 95): see above, II.15.1.31.
- II.102 Ch 1140 (Harm 96): see above, II.15.1.32.

- II.103 Ch 1141 (Harm 97): see above, II.15.1.33.
- II.104 Ch 1142 (Harm 98): see above, II.15.2.33.
- II.105 Ch 1143 (Harm 99): see above, II.15.2.34.
- II.106 Ch 1144 (Harm 100): see above, II.15.2.35.
- II.107 Ch 1146 (Harm 102): see above, II.15.2.36.
- II.108 Ch 1147 (Harm 103): see above, II.15.2.37.
- II.109 Ch 1148 (Harm 104): see above, II.15.2.38.
- II.110 Ch 1149 (Harm 105): see above, II.15.2.39.
- II.111 Ch 1150 (Harm 106): see above, II.15.2.39.
- II.112 Ch 1151 (Harm 109): see above, II.15.1.34.
- II.113 Ch 1152 (Harm 110): see above, II.15.2.40.
- II.114 Ch 1153 (Harm 111): see above, II.15.1.35.
- II.115 Ch 1154 (Harm 112): see above, II.15.2.41.
- II.116 Ch 1155 (Harm 114): see above, II.15.2.42.
- II.117 Ch 1156 (Harm 115): see above, II.15.1.36.
- II.118 Ch 1157 (Harm 116): see above, II.15.2.43.
- II.119 Ch 1158 (Harm 117): see above, II.15.2.44.
- II.120 Ch 1159 (Harm 118): see above, II.15.2.45.
- II.121 Ch 1161 (Harm 120): see above, II.15.1.37.
- II.122 Ch 1162 (Harm in Clemoes): see above, II.15.1.38.



II.123 Ch 1163 (Harm 71): Harmer argues that ‘there seems no reason for doubting that this writ [in favour of Bishop Giso of Wells] is a modernised copy of an authentic writ of King Harold’ (Harmer 1989: 276). The only Norse-derived term in the writ is OE *unlagu*. It appears in a structure which reproduces almost verbatim the text in Ch 1157 (Harm 116), on which see above, II.15.2.43. Accordingly, this usage is treated as derivative.

II.124 Ch 1232 (Rob 113): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 461) dates this document recording the grant of lands of Earl Leofric of Mercia to Worcester to 1052 x 1057.

II.125 Ch 1240 (Harm 70): see above, II.15.1.39.

II.126 Ch 1377 (Rob 37): This document, which Robertson (Robertson 1939: 323) dates to 963 x 975, records an exchange of lands between Æthelwold, bishop of Winchester, and a certain Wulfstan Ucceā, who held lands in Huntingdonshire and Northamptonshire (see further Whitelock 1930: 129–30, and Robertson 1939: 323). Given that the ultimate beneficiaries of the exchange were Thorney Abbey, in Cambridgeshire, and Peterborough Abbey and that the document is preserved in Peterborough’s *Liber Niger* (see above, II.21), the document is likely to have been drafted in East Anglia (see also Kelly 2009: 276).

II.127 Ch 1389 (Rob 89): The document records a grant by Æthelnoth, archbishop of Christ Church, to Christ Church. Robertson (Robertson 1939: 422) assigns the grant to 1036, while the *Electronic Sawyer* (no. 1389) suggests 1037 instead. The document has been copied in a hand of the mid-eleventh century in London, British Library, MS Cotton Claudius A.iii (Ker 1990: no. 185). On what we know about the Earl Sired mentioned in this document, see Keynes (Keynes 1994: 76).

II.128 Ch 1391 (Rob 98): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 433) dates this document, recording the lease of land by Ælfwine, bishop of Worcester, to a certain Osgod, to 1043 x 1044.

II.129 Ch 1394 (Rob 94): This document, recording the lease of lands by Lyfing, bishop of Worcester, can be dated to 1042, as suggested by Finberg (Finberg 1961: no. 349).

II.130 Ch 1403 (Rob 107): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 450) dates this text, recording a lease by Bishop Stigand of Winchester, to 1047 x 1050.

II.131 Ch 1406 (Rob 112): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 460) dates this document, recording a grant by Bishop Ealdred of Worcester, to 1051 x 1052.

II.132 Ch 1409 (Rob 111): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 456) dates this document, recording a grant by Bishop Ealdred of Worcester, to 1046 x 1053, but probably to 1051 x 1052; this is the reason for its inclusion in Group 6.

II.133 Ch 1426 (Rob 117): The document records a lease of land by the abbot and the community of Bath to Archbishop Stigand. Robertson (Robertson 1939: 469) dates the lease to 1061 x 1065. The text is recorded in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 111, a twelfth-century cartulary of the Abbey of Bath (see Robertson 1939: 451, and Laing 1993: 21).

II.134 Ch 1448 (Rob 39): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 325) argues in favour of dating this charter, which deals with lands in East Anglia, to 963. The text is recorded in Peterborough's *Liber Niger*, on which see above, II.21.

II.135 Ch 1455 (Rob 62): This text presents an agreement between Wulfric, abbot of St Augustine's, Canterbury (fl. 993–1005), and Ealdred, son of Lyfing, about land at *Clife*, Kent. It is recorded in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 286, a gospel-book from St Augustine's, in a hand which Ker (Ker 1990: no. 55) considers to be contemporary with the events recorded in the text (cp. Kelly 1995: 118–19), and which is likely to have been working in St Augustine's. The dates of Wulfric's abbacy provide us with the *termini post quem* and *ad quem* for the text (see Robertson 1939: 371–72).

II.136 Ch 1465 (Rob 86): The document records an arrangement between a priest called Eadsige and Christ Church, Canterbury, concerning some lands in Kent. Robertson (Robertson 1939: 419) dates the arrangement to 1032, while the *Electronic Sawyer* (no. 1465) suggests either 1032 or 1035. Even though it is not attested in contemporary manuscripts (see Robertson 1939: 419, and the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 1465), Nightingale (Nightingale 1987: 160–61) argues in favour of accepting its uses of the Norse-derived terms OE *marc* and *hūsting* as representing authentic wording of the first half of the eleventh century.

II.137 Ch 1468 (Rob 97): The document presents the agreement between Æthelmær, Ufi, abbot of Bury St Edmunds, and the community there with regard to some lands in Norfolk. Robertson (Robertson 1939: 431) dates the agreement to 1043 x 1044. It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.138 Ch 1469 (Rob 99): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 435) dates this charter, which deals with lands in Herefordshire, to 1043 x 1046. Its record in Hereford, D. & C., P. I (*c.* 1050, according to the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 1469) must have been almost contemporary. Although Herefordshire is outside the areas initially settled by the Scandinavian newcomers, it probably received a later influx of Old Norse speakers (see above, 1.3.1, and note 76 in Chapter 3).

II.139 Ch 1471 (Rob 101): Harmer (Harmer 1989: 51) explains that this document, recording a grant of lands in Kent, cannot be earlier than 26 December 1045, while Knowles and others (Knowles and others 1972: 236) date it to 1045 x 1047 (see also Robertson 1939: 436). This is in keeping with the fact that the text is recorded in London, British Library, MS Cotton Augustus II.70 in a hand of the mid-eleventh century.

II.140 Ch 1472 (Rob 102): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 438) dates this document, recording an agreement involving lands in Kent, to 1044 x 1045.

II.141 Ch 1473 (Rob 103): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 439) dates this document, which records the purchase of some lands in Kent, to 1044 x 1048. It is written in a near-contemporary hand in London, British Library, MS Cotton Augustus II.35 (see the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 1473).

II.142 Ch 1474 (Rob 105): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 447) dates this document, recording an agreement involving lands in Devon, to 1045 x 1046.

II.143 Ch 1476 (Rob 114): The text records an agreement between the Old Minster, Winchester, and Wulfweard the White. Robertson (Robertson 1939: 462) dates the agreement to *c.* 1053. Even though the text is only recorded in a copy from the twelfth century, London, British Library, MS Add. 15350, fol. 98b, it is generally believed to be authentic (see the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 1476).

II.144 Ch 1478 (Rob 115): This document records an agreement between Wulfwig, bishop of Dorchester (1053 x 1067), Leofric, earl of Mercia (see Williams 1999, with references), and Godgifu, his wife, concerning the endowment of a monastery at Stowe St Mary, Lincolnshire. Robertson (Robertson 1939: 465) dates the agreement to 1053 x 1055, while Harmer (Harmer 1989: 247 n. 2) suggests that the text would have been drawn up not long after the event. Even though the text deals with lands in Lincolnshire, there does not seem to be any reason to suggest that the drafting of the document should be associated with the Scandinavianized areas.

II.145 Ch 1487 (Whitelock 13): This document is recorded in the early eleventh-century manuscript London, British Library, Stowe Charter 36 (see British Museum, Department of Manuscripts, 1895–96: 705, no. 36). The *Electronic Sawyer* (no. 1487) assigns it to 975 x 1016 (cp. Whitelock 1930: 133), while Hart (Hart 1966: no. 24) dates it to 989. The document refers to lands mainly in East Anglia.

II.146 Ch 1489 (Whitelock 26): Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 182) dates this grant of lands in various locations, mainly Suffolk and Norfolk, to various beneficiaries, including the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds, to 1035 x 1040. However, given the language in which the grant is expressed, she does not rule out the possibility that the actual writing of the text took place twenty or thirty years afterwards.

II.147 Ch 1490 (Whitelock 28): This will records the grant of lands in Norfolk and Suffolk to various religious houses in East Anglia, including the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds. Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 185) dates it to 1042 x 1045. It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.148 Ch 1492 (Nap-Steven 10): The *Electronic Sawyer* (no. 1492) dates this document, the will of Ælfwold, bishop of Crediton, to 1008 x 1012 (cp. Napier and Stevenson 1895: 125–26), while Whitelock (Whitelock 1979: 581) believes it to be ‘not later than 1016’. It is recorded in an eleventh-century entry in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Eng. hist. a. 2 (no. XIII), possibly contemporary with the document (see Madan and Craster 1924: no. 31346).

Most of the tenth- and eleventh-century documents in the codex are associated with CREDITON, DEVON, which may give us an indication of the location where the original compilation took place.

II.149 Ch 1499 (Whitelock 35): Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 204–05) dates this will, which grants lands in Norfolk to the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds, to 1047 x 1070. It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.150 Ch 1519 (Whitelock 34): This will records the grant of lands, mainly in Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk, to various beneficiaries, amongst which the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds is the most important. Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 201) dates it to 1052 x 1066. It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.151 Ch 1521 (Whitelock 29): Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 187) dates this document, which records grants of lands in Essex, Suffolk, and Norfolk to various beneficiaries, including the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds, to 1035 x 1044. It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.152 Ch 1525 (Whitelock 37–38): This document, where Sifflæd bequests Marlingford, Norfolk, to the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds, is likely to date from the late tenth or eleventh century (notably, the abbey was in possession of Marlingford by 1066; see Whitelock 1930: 206). It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.153 Ch 1527 (Whitelock 24): This document can be assigned to the eleventh century, before 1038. It presents various bequests of lands in East Anglia, some of them to the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds (see Whitelock 1930: 179). It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.154 Ch 1529 (Whitelock 36): The date of this bequest of land by Thurkil and Æthelgyth to the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds is not easy to determine. However, on the basis of what is known about the people and the lands mentioned, it seems likely to originate from the second half of the eleventh century (see Whitelock 1930: 205–06, and the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 1529). It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.155 Ch 1530 (Whitelock 30): Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 189) dates this will bequesting lands in Essex to Christ Church, Canterbury, to 1042 x 1043.

II.156 Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31): This document, which Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 192) dates to 1043 x 1045, records bequests of lands in East Anglia and Essex to various beneficiaries, including Ely Abbey and the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds. It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.157 Ch 1535 (Whitelock 32): Whitelock (Whitelock 1939: 197) dates this will recording bequests of lands in East Anglia and Essex to Christ Church, Canterbury, to c. 1046, and certainly before 1053. It is not clear whether the language of the document should be associated with the testatrix, who, like other members of her family (see Whitelock 1930: nos 33 and 34), may have originated from East Anglia; or with the scribes of Christ Church. Given the oral character of the Anglo-Saxon will (see Hazeltine 1930, and Danet and Bogoch 1992), the former possibility may be more likely. However, the uncertainty about the origin of the testatrix and the fact that the document as it stands is a later copy of the Anglo-Saxon original probably made at Christ Church are reasons to remain uncertain about the dialectal origin of the language recorded in the document.

II.158 Ch 1537 (Whitelock 27): This will, which includes a bequest to the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds, is dated to 1022 x 1043 by Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 185). It is recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see below, IV.1.2 and note 10 in Appendix IV.

II.159 Ch 1659 (Rob 68): Craster (Craster 1954: 192–93) assigns this document, which records a grant of lands to St Cuthbert's, Chester-le-Street / Durham, to Bishop Aldhun's pontificate (990 x 1018).

II.160 Ch 1660 (Rob 60): Craster (Craster 1954: 192–94) also includes this grant by Earl Uhtred (on whom see Robertson 1939: 368, and Craster 1954: 194) amongst those conducted during Bishop Aldhun's pontificate (see above, II.159).

II.161 Charm 12.2 (Storms): This charm was recorded in London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius E.xviii c. 1050, probably in Winchester (see Ker 1990: no. 224).

II.162 ChrodR: Langefeld suggests that the Old English translation of the enlarged Rule of Chrodegang de Metz is likely to have been undertaken 'somewhere within the sphere of the Winchester influence' in the late tenth century, possibly 'between the late 950s and 970s' (Langefeld 2003: 144), while Drouot (Drouot 2004 and Drouot 2006: ch. 7) prefers to date it to the 940s or 950s. The only manuscript recording the translation of the virtually complete text is Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 191, an Exeter manuscript from the third quarter of the eleventh century (see Ker 1990: no. 46, and Langefeld 2003: 44–46). It is therefore not clear whether the use of OE *lagu* should be attributed to the original translator or to a later copyist, a problem which the term shares with some personal names added in ch. 2 of the Old English version (see Langefeld 2003: 144). Given this uncertainty and the fact that the translation is generally dated c. 1000 (cp. A. Fischer 1989: 107), the use of OE *lagu* in this text is included in Group 3.

II.163 *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*: The annals included in the various versions of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* have a very complex history. It is outside the scope of this study to provide a thorough analysis of their origins and relations. Thus, these aspects are discussed only in connection with the annals recording Norse-derived terms. The annals are discussed in alphabetical and chronological order:

II.163.1 Chron (CaligA 15): In the second half of the eleventh century a series of annals relating mainly to Christ Church, Canterbury, were included in London, British Library, MS Cotton Caligula A.xv; the annals accompany a table of years running from 988 to 1193 (see Ker 1990: no. 139, art. A.r).



II.163.2 ChronA (Bately) 60 BC–AD 924 (= ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 60 BC–AD 924 = ChronD (Cubbin) AD 1–924 = ChronE (Irvine) AD 1–891): Campbell (A. Campbell 1938: 1–4) explains that, after the common core of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, which extends until 891 (here referred to as ChronCom), a seemingly official, but separate series of annals, extending from 891 to 924 (here referred to as ChronCont1), was sent to the various houses where copies of the common core had previously been sent (see Plummer 1892–99: II, §110.3).<sup>7</sup> However, the ancestor of the E-text seems to have been kept in a house which did not receive a copy of ChronCont1. The annals 891 x 920 are written in the A-manuscript of the *Chronicle*, viz. Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 173, by various hands belonging to the early decades of the tenth century (see Bately 1986: xxv–xxxiv, with references, and Dumville 1992a: 95), which gives us as *terminus ad quem* for the compilation of ChronCont1. Even though the exact place of composition of these annals remains unclear (see Dumville 1992a: 55–72), there is no reason to associate them with the Scandinavianized areas. While ChronA (Bately) 914.34 records OE 'holdas', ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 915.29 = ChronD (Cubbin) 915.33 have OE 'eorlas'; this lexical replacement could have taken place at any point after this continuation was sent to various houses; for the sake of convenience, this change is presented as part of Group 1.

II.163.3 ChronA (Bately) 1002–70: Bately (Bately 1986: xciii) explains that, during this period, the A-text has eleven main entries, which are not paralleled in any other version of the *Chronicle*.

II.163.4 ChronAbing: see below, II.163.8.

II.163.5 ChronÆC: see below, II.163.6.

II.163.6 ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 983–1022 (= ChronD (Cubbin) 983–1022 = ChronE (Irvine) 983–1022): The entries for these years, i.e. the so-called *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut* (see Conner 1996: liv; here referred to as ChronÆC), have been attributed different origins: Dumville (Dumville 1983: 27) gives Abingdon, London, and Ramsey as three equally likely possibilities, and rejects Canterbury. The latter has, however, been brought back into the discussion by O'Brien O'Keeffe (O'Brien O'Keeffe 2001: lxviii; cp. Plummer 1892–99: II, §110.7, Stafford 1978: 16 and 38 n. 7, and Seebold 1992: 434), while Conner (Conner 1996: lvi), without

<sup>7</sup> See, however, Bately 1985 for a thorough discussion of the cut-off point between the original core annals and ChronCont1.

arguing in favour of any centre, rejects Abingdon as one of the candidates. The *terminus ad quem* for the composition of these annals is provided by the manuscript of the C-text, viz. London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius B.i, which was written by several hands of the mid-eleventh century (see O'Brien O'Keeffe 2001: xxvi). Although the annals dealing with the reigns of the two kings do not represent a clearly unified text (see above, 4.3.2, and Conner 1996: liii–lvi, with references), those associated with the reign of Æthelred do, and Keynes (Keynes 1978: 231, and 245 n. 19) hypothesizes that those annals are likely to have been composed at one time between 1016 and 1023 (probably in 1016–17).

II.163.7 ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1030: This annal is related to ChronD (Cubbin) 1030 = ChronE (Irvine) 1030 but includes additional information of uncertain origin referring to Earl Hakon (see Conner 1996: xxv–xxvi, and O'Brien O'Keeffe 2001: lxviii). The information would have been incorporated by 1044 (see below, II.163.8).

II.163.8 ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1035–48, 1049–56, and 1065–66 (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1035–48, 1049–56, and 1065–66, and ChronE (Irvine) 1035–48, 1049–56, and 1064):<sup>8</sup> Conner (Conner 1996: xxxiv, lxx–lxxvii, and lxxvii–lxxviii) suggests that these annals were probably composed at Abingdon, although he points out that, as far as the 1049–56 annals are concerned, 'an argument can be made to attribute the addition entirely to non-Abingdon influences, because of the lack of specific Abingdon coloration' (Conner 1996: lxvi).<sup>9</sup> Accordingly, they are commonly known as the *Abingdon Chronicle* (here referred to as ChronAbing). O'Brien O'Keeffe (O'Brien O'Keeffe 2001: lxxiv–xcii) would prefer to associate the *Abingdon Chronicle* with Canterbury, while more recently Baxter has argued that the annals for the mid-eleventh century in the C-version are likely to mix some Abingdon material with 'Mercian' material, 'Mercia' denoting in the article 'the region between the River Thames in the south and the rivers Humber and Mersey in the north, and between the Welsh border in the west and East Anglia in the east' (Baxter 2007b: 1190 n. 5). Although Baxter (Baxter 2007b: 1219–20) explains that it is impossible to be more specific about the actual origin of the 'Mercian' information, he sees Evesham as the most likely possibility. In any case, there is no reason to attribute to these annals an

<sup>8</sup> For a detailed analysis of the relationships between these annals, see Conner 1996 and O'Brien O'Keeffe 2001: lxviii–lxxiv.

<sup>9</sup> On ChronD (Cubbin) 1065–66, see also Cubbin 1996: xlvi, with references.

origin in a Scandinavianized area. The annals up to 1044 seem to have been composed by 1044, a point from which the annals may have been entered on a yearly basis, or at least in short intervals on the C-manuscript (see Ker 1990: no. 191, Conner 1996: xxvi–xxvii and xxxiv–xxxv, and Baxter 2007b: 1120–24; cf. O’Brien O’Keeffe 2001: xci). Conner (Conner 1996: lxiii) points out that the update for the period 1049–56 is likely to have been done at one time. Given that the annal for 1049 is not likely to have been composed before 1050, the Norse-derived terms it records are included in Group 6. With regard to the 1065 and 1066 annals in the C-text, O’Brien O’Keeffe (O’Brien O’Keeffe 2001: lxxii) explains that they are likely to have been written down some time after the Conquest.

II.163.9 ChronCom: see above, II.163.2.

II.163.10 ChronCont1: see above, II.163.2.

II.163.11 ChronD (Cubbin) 959 (= ChronE (Irvine) 959 = ChronF (Baker) 958): see below, II.257.1.

II.163.12 ChronD (Cubbin) 975 (= ChronE (Irvine) 975): This annal is clearly associated with ChronA (Bately) 975 = ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 975 (see Bately 1986: xci). However, the D- and E-texts add the title OE *eorl* to Oslac, which is missing from the A- and C-versions (see Cubbin 1996: xxxiv). This addition can be assigned to the period before 1031 when the shared source of the D- and E-texts was being kept in the north (see Cubbin 1996: lii). Since it is not clear when the title was incorporated into the text, the term is assigned to Group 3. On the poem on Edgar, see below, II.257.1.

II.163.13 ChronD (Cubbin) 1016: While the information in this annal generally agrees with that provided in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1016 = ChronE (Irvine) 1016 (see above, II.163.6), the D-annal adds some information which is not present in the other versions. ChronD (Cubbin) 1016.92 specifies that Ola’s island is near Deerhurst, and adds that Cnut and Edmund became ‘feolagan 7 wedbroðra’. It seems appropriate to associate this information with the compilation of the text *c.* 1060 (cp. Cubbin 1996: lxxviii). The record and transmission over the years of (possibly) the original terms used for the Anglo-Scandinavian agreement is not too difficult to accept given its importance, and the fact that it represents ‘one of the most significant Scandinavian-English contacts (certainly in the SWM [South-West Midlands])’ (Dance 2003: 192 n. 12).<sup>10</sup> For the sake of convenience, this usage is associated with ChronWorc (see below, II.163.16).

<sup>10</sup> On the agreement, see Lawson 1993: 20.

II.163.14 ChronD (Cubbin) 1023: This annal is not paralleled in the other versions of the *Chronicle* (see Cubbin 1996: xlvi); it is therefore not clear where the annal may originate from, nor when it would have been composed. However, the topic of the annal does not suggest an origin in the Scandinavianized areas. It is likely to have been composed by c. 1060, when the conflation of the D-text took place. Accordingly, the annal is included in Group 4.

II.163.15 ChronD (Cubbin) 1043: Even though it is clear that this annal follows the so-called *Abingdon Chronicle* (see above, II.163.8), there seems to have been a change at some point during the transmission of the text. While ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1043.7–8 reads 'nam of hire eall þæt heo ahte on golde 7 on seolfre 7 on unasecgendlicum þingum' (= ChronE (Irvine) 1042.7–8), ChronD (Cubbin) 1043.6 summarizes this as 'bereafedan hi æt eallon þan garsaman þe heo ahte'. The lexical change is likely to have taken place when the D-text was compiled c. 1060 (see Cubbin 1996: liv–lv and lxxviii–lxxix, and Pons-Sanz 2010: 290–91 n. 74). The D-text also includes a reference to Earls Leofric, Godwine, and Siward which is not part of the *Abingdon Chronicle* either; for the sake of convenience, the use of OE *eorl* is here associated with the aforementioned lexical change. The use of the two Norse-derived terms is associated with ChronWorc (see below, II.163.16).

II.163.16 ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1, 1053, 1054, 1055 (material which is not part of ChronAbing; see above, II.163.8), 1057, 1058, 1061, 1063: Cubbin (Cubbin 1996: lxxviii–lxxix) points out that the annals for the 1050s in the D-text have a very clear interest in the South-West Midlands and the Worcester diocese (cp. Cubbin 1996: lxx–lxxii); accordingly, he would like to associate the annals with Worcester itself. He explains that Aldred was Bishop of Worcester from c. 1046 to 1062 and Archbishop of York from 1061 to 1069. If Aldred were responsible for the compilation and writing of the D-text, this would explain not only the South-West Midland interests during the 1050s, but also the interest in York between 1056 and 1075. These annals are here referred to as ChronWorc.

II.163.17 ChronD (Cubbin) 1065–80 (cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1064–80): Irvine (Irvine 2004: lxxxii–lxxxiv) explains that the D- and E-text of the *Chronicle* share a substantial amount of material for these years, which is probably derived from some northern annals (here referred to as ChronNor2; on ChronD (Cubbin) 1067, see Stafford 2006, and below, note 14 in this appendix). However, the two texts also differ significantly, especially from 1077 to 1080, which indicates that they must have had

access to other sources. The D-text has in many cases fuller versions of the northern material and shows a clear interest in the Scottish affairs, while the E-version has been described by Dumville as ‘a drastic boiling down by someone not very interested in Scottish affairs’ (Dumville 1983: 36) (see also above, 4.2.1).

Wormald argues in favour of associating the reference to the renewal of ‘Cnutes lage’ in ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.27 = ChronE (Irvine) 1064.15 with Aldred’s influence (see above, II.163.14), for he is likely to have been involved in the 1065 affairs: ‘the “D”/“E” *Chronicles* may offer inside information’ (Wormald 1999: 130–31). It is for this reason that this occurrence of the term is associated with ChronWorc (see above, II.163.16). During the process of revision of this annal, the reference to Tostig’s outlawry could also have been added (ChronD (Cubbin) 1065.12 = ChronE (Irvine) 1064.2).<sup>11</sup>

II.163.18 ChronE (Irvine) IntCont: Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 636, the manuscript of the E-text of the *Chronicle*, is a Peterborough production, probably associated with the efforts to replenish the library after the 1116 fire (see Irvine 2004: xiii). The annals up to 1121 rely in the main on materials from various sources (see above, II.163.2, II.163.6, II.163.8, II.163.11–12, and below, II.163.19–21), but they include twenty passages relating to Peterborough; these are the so-called Interpolations (see Irvine 2004: xc–ic). The annals for 1122–31 constitute what is generally known as First Continuation, which includes materials relating to Peterborough, together with other materials which may rely on a version of the *Chronicle* which had been continued beyond 1121. That version may have been written in Latin rather than in English (see Irvine 2004: lxxxvii–lxxxviii, Irvine 2010: 56–66, and Home 2005: 22 and 133–34). Thus, the language of the Interpolations and the First Continuation has to be associated with Peterborough. They may be the work of the same person (see Home 2005: 155–60, and Home 2010: 85–88); even if they are not, given that they were produced in the same centre within very few years and that they show clear linguistic similarities, they are here treated together (see further IV.1.22). Furthermore, there are some alterations to the pre-1121 annals which should

<sup>11</sup> See further Dumville 1983: 35–36 and Bredehoft 2010: 39–42 on the likelihood that those dealing with the annals which would end up in the E-version had access to some of the revisions to the ChronNor2 annals which were probably carried out in Worcester. I am very thankful to Prof. Thomas Bredehoft for having allowed me to see a copy of his article before its publication.

also be associated with the writing of the E-text in Peterborough: e.g. while ChronD (Cubbin) 1072.8 refers to those who turned against King William, including Hereward, simply as 'hi', ChronE (Irvine) 1071.7–8 emphasizes that they are 'þa utlagan'. This is just one of a series of subtle changes which show that the account was slightly altered when the text was written down in Peterborough, a house which had suffered great losses at Hereward's hands, as recorded in the Peterborough interpolation in ChronE (Irvine) 1070 (see Home 2005: 101–07, and Pons-Sanz 2010: 294; cp. OE *gēatan* in ChronE (Irvine) 1087, see above, 2.4.2.K).<sup>12</sup>

II.163.19 ChronE (Irvine) 1023–41: Irvine (Irvine 2004: lxxviii, lxxv) explains that during these years the E-text does not seem to have shared the same source as the C-text of the *Chronicle*. She hypothesizes that the interpolation may be attributed to its St Augustine's period and that the annals would have become integrated in the text 'after (but not necessarily much after) the annals for 983–1022 and 1042–3<sup>b</sup>' (Irvine 2004: lxxviii). Conner (Conner 1996: liii–liv) suggests that the base text from which the E-text derives would have been sent to St Augustine's c. 1044, while Irvine explains that 'there is no evidence in E of particular interest in St Augustine's after the annal for 1061' (Irvine 2004: lxxvi). It is therefore likely that the basis for the 1023–41 annals in the E-text was written during the first half of the eleventh century. That is the reason behind the incorporation of these annals in Group 4. In the 1039-annal, the E-text shares the information regarding the payment for ships during Harthcnut's reign with the entries in the *Abingdon Chronicle* (on which see above, II.163.8) and that is the reason why the use of OE *marc* in the E- and F-texts in that context is associated with that in the C- and D-texts (cp. Baxter 2007b: 1198–99 and 1224). The E-text, however, also refers to the payment for ships during Harold's reign, and this information has to be associated with E's alternative source (see Irvine 2004: lxxiii).

II.163.20 ChronE (Irvine) 1043b–63: Irvine (Irvine 2004: lxxv) explains that the E-text of the *Chronicle* is relatively independent from the C- and D-texts for these annals. Given that they include a series of references to St Augustine's, Canterbury, and that they show considerable knowledge of Kentish events, they are likely to originate from the south-east (see Irvine 2004: lxxvi, with references, and Baxter 2007b).

<sup>12</sup> On the linguistic features of the Peterborough interpolation in ChronE (Irvine) 1070, see also Millar 1997b.



II.163.21 ChronE (Irvine) 1070–1121: The origin of these annals, when they do not coincide with those in the D-text, has to remain uncertain (see Plummer 1892–99: II, §53, C. Clark 1970: xxi–xxiii, and Irvine 2004: lxxxiii, and Irvine 2010: 52–53). It seems clear that the E-text relies on annals which must have had a wide circulation, because the text from 1080 is very closely reproduced by the Latin translation in the Waverley Annals (see Irvine 2004: lxxxv–lxxxvi; on the Waverley Annals, see further above, 4.2.1).<sup>13</sup> Interestingly, however, all the attestations of terms which could be associated with the Norse-derived OE *sabt* word-field in ChronE (Irvine) 1091 occur in the part of the annal dealing with Scottish affairs, which may suggest some reliance on northern annals. Yet, this suggestion has to remain purely speculative. It is also difficult to distinguish different stages in the composition of the annals (see C. Clark 1970: xxiv). Therefore, the loan-words recorded in these annals could be treated separately; however, given that the annals share a very similar use of Norse-derived terms and for the sake of simplicity, they are treated here as a block. With regard to their date of composition, Clark (C. Clark 1970: xxi) hypothesizes that they are likely to have been composed soon after the events they describe.<sup>14</sup> On ChronE (Irvine) 1071, see above, II.163.18.

II.163.22 ChronF (Baker): Even though the F-text of the *Chronicle* is generally considered to be ‘secondary’ because of its reliance on other versions, particularly the E-version (see Baker 2000: xxviii–xxxix), there are some Norse-derived terms which are not paralleled in other versions and which point instead to the time of compilation of the text. Baker (Baker 2000: lxxvi) dates this period to 1100 x 1107. Accordingly, the terms which appear in the following annals are analysed together:

II.163.22.1 ChronF (Baker) 694: Most of this annal is an adaptation of S 22, which purports to be a grant of privileges by Wihtred to Kentish houses (see Baker 2000: lvii–lviii, where the charter is wrongly identified with S 20, and the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 22).

<sup>13</sup> E.g. OE ‘sæhte’ and ‘gesæhtlad’ in ChronE (Irvine) 1091.19 and 40 are rendered by L *concordia* ‘harmony, concord’ and *concordatus* (cp. L *concordare* ‘to agree, be united’) in the Waverley Annals (see Luard 1864–69: II, 201).

<sup>14</sup> On the poem on William the Conqueror in ChronE (Irvine) 1086 and its association with an Anglo-Saxon tradition rather than the continental tradition of William’s court, see Bredehoft 2001: 115–18, with references. For a suggestion that this poem may share the same author as what can be seen as a poem on Malcolm and Margaret in ChronD (Cubbin) 1067 (‘a self-contained poem of thirty-five lines’ which can be found in ChronD (Cubbin) 1067.16–46) and that the author may in fact be Bishop Wulfstan II of Worcester, see Bredehoft 2009: 190–96.



II.163.22.2 ChronF (Baker) 845: While ChronA (Bately) 845.1 and 845.3 = ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 845.1 and 845.2 refer to Eanulf and Osric as *ealdormenn* and ChronD (Cubbin) 845.1 and 845.2 = ChronE (Irvine) 845.1 and 845.2 call them *dux*, the F-annal refers to them with the term OE *eorl*. This usage is in keeping with the equivalence of L *dux* and OE *eorl* in English sources of the pre- and post-Conquest period, especially before 1068 (see above, note 84 in Chapter 3).

II.163.22.3 ChronF (Baker) 995: Most of this annal, dealing with affairs in Christ Church, Canterbury, is not paralleled in the other versions of the *Chronicle*. Baker (Baker 2000: lviii) suggests that the F-text may be related to S 914, a charter forged by Eadui Basan which explains how, following the advice of Archbishop Ælfric, Æthelred expelled the priests from Christ Church (see the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 914).

II.163.22.4 ChronF (Baker) 1009: The F-text is the only version to record that Wulnoth was 'Godwines fæder eorles' (see Baker 2000: lxi). Similarly, as explained above, 3.4.2.2.E.2, it replaces OE *niman frid* in the *Chronicle of Æthelred and Cnut* with OE *gridian*.

II.163.22.5 ChronF (Baker) 1031: The reference to 'Rodbert eorl' derives from Norman Chronicles (see Baker 2000: liv) and is not paralleled in any other of the versions of the *Chronicle*.

II.163.22.6 ChronF (Baker) 1048: The F-text for this annal, which relies on ChronE (Irvine) 1046b, is the only version to clarify that Svein is 'Godwines sunu eorles'.

II.163.23 ChronNor2: see above, II.163.17.

II.163.24 ChronWorc: see above, II.163.16.

II.164 Deut: see above, II.5.

II.165 DurRitGl: see below, II.223.

II.166 Exod: see above, II.5.

II.167 Gen: see above, II.5.

II.168 \*Gl (Ru): The tenth-century glosses to the Rushworth Gospels can be divided into two groups: those attributable to Farman, who wrote in a Mercian dialect (MtGl (Ru) \*, MkGl (Ru) 1.1–2.15, and JnGl (Ru) 18.1–18.3; see

Menner 1934, and Coates 1997) and those attributable to Owun, which are written in a Northumbrian dialect. The latter, generally called Rushworth 2, are here referred to as \*Gl (Ru). Farman probably used a source close to Aldred's glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels (on which see below, II.223) when his work was well advanced (see Kotake 2012, where the commonly accepted view, presented for instance in Ross 1979a, that Farman relied directly on the Lindisfarne glosses is disputed). Owun's work, on the other hand, is very close to Aldred's. It has traditionally been suggested that, like Farman, Owun copied his glosses directly from Aldred's (see Bibire and Ross 1981), but Kotake (Kotake 2008a and Kotake 2008b) has shown that the relationship between these sets of glosses is not as simple.<sup>15</sup> Instead, it is likely to be the case that both glossators had access to a number of (currently unidentified) sources. On the relationship between the two sets of glosses, see also above, 4.2.3.

II.169 HlGl (Oliphant): The Latin-Old English glossary in London, British Library, MS Harley 3376 is likely to have been put together in the early years of the eleventh century in Worcester (see Cooke 1997: 442 and 445–48; cp. Cooke 1993: 29 and 59, where the second half of the eleventh century is suggested instead as the date of compilation of the glossary). Cooke explains that the compiler of the glossary relied on previous glossaries (e.g. exemplars similar to the Corpus and Cleopatra glossaries) as well as 'books in his own library' (Cooke 1997: 454; cp. Cooke 1993: 144–75).

While some of the Latin and Old English glosses for L *decretum* 'decree, ordinance; decision, resolution' in HlGl (Oliphant) D2 (viz. 'institutum statutum diffinitum iudicium positum consilium placitum, gepoht, laga, gesetnes') can be paralleled somewhere else (cp. CorpGl 2 (Hessels) 4.146, where the same lemma is rendered as 'institutum <vel> placitum', and CorpGl 2 (Hessels) 187, where 'gepoht' is used instead), the use of OE *lagu* finds no parallel in the *OEC*. The term could, therefore, be associated with the influence in early eleventh-century Worcester of Archbishop Wulfstan, who clearly preferred the Norse-derived OE *lagu* to the native equivalent OE *æ* (see above, 3.4.2.2.A).

II.170 HomM 15 (Wanley): This homily fragment is recorded in London, British Library, MS Cotton Otho A.xiii, which can be dated to the first half of the eleventh century (Ker 1990: no. 173). Given that OE *lagu* is used here to

<sup>15</sup> I am very thankful to Dr Tadashi Kotake for having provided me with copies of his articles.

refer to a religious rather than a secular law, and that Wulfstan seems otherwise to have been the first to use the term in such contexts (see above, 3.4.2.2.A), it seems appropriate to leave aside the possible circularity of the argument and to attribute the homily to the first half of the eleventh century rather than to the second half of the tenth century.

II.171 HomS 30 (TristrApp 2): This homily is recorded in a Worcester manuscript from the third quarter of the eleventh century, viz. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 114 (see Ker 1990: no. 331). This provides a *terminus ad quem* for the composition of this homily, while its reliance on Wulfstan's and Ælfric's work (see Bazire and Cross 1989: 104–07) indicates a *terminus post quem*. The place of composition remains unclear, but an origin in the Worcester area would be fully in keeping with the attestation of the Middle English reflex of OE *leost* and its word-field in Dance's corpus (Dance 2003; see above, 3.4.2.10.B.2). Hofstetter (Hofstetter 1987: 204) notes that the text does not follow the Winchester lexical practices.

II.172 HomU 17 (HomU 17.1 (Kluge E) + HomU 17.2 (Kluge G)): This prose version of the *Phoenix* is recorded, not only in London, British Library, MS Cotton Vespasian D.xiv (on which see Ker 1990: no. 209, and below, IV.1.13), but also in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 198 in a hand from the second half of the eleventh century (see Ker 1990: no. 48, art. 67). The manuscript was in Worcester by the thirteenth century, and it may also be there that the text under consideration was copied because Ker has pointed out that its language suggests that it was written in the west of England. Kluge (Kluge 1884–85: 475) dated the text itself to the second half of the eleventh century, which is fully in keeping with the fact that its representation of the interim paradise coincides with the vision presented in other texts from the late Anglo-Saxon period (see Kabir 2001: ch. 7). Interestingly, the Old English text has verbal affinities with an Old Norse prose version of the *Phoenix* recorded in Copenhagen, University of Copenhagen, MSS AM 764 4° (fourteenth century) and AM 194 8° (fifteenth century). Kabir describes these parallels as follows: 'consistent level of mild lexical replacement of cognate words and phrases within largely stable syntactic and semantic frames', and attributes them to a possible 'memorial transmission from an Old English to an Old Norse environment' (Kabir 2001: 169). Yerkes (Yerkes 1984) argues in favour of the opposite direction for the transmission, partially on the basis of the relationship between *carlfugol* / *cwenfugol* in the Old English text and *karlfugl*

/ *kvennfugl* in the AM 194 text. However, what we know about the intellectual relationships between England and Scandinavia in the late eleventh century may rather support the direction of transmission suggested by Kabir (Kabir 2001) and others before her (see further Pons-Sanz 2007e). In any case, the relationship between these texts could be taken as one further example of the association between the West and Scandinavia during the eleventh century (see Cubbin 1996: lxxvi–lxxvii, and above, 4.2.1).

II.173 HomU 21 (Nap 1): see below, II.257.2.

II.174 HomU 26 (Nap 29): see below, II.191.

II.175 HomU 27 (Nap 30): The outer dates for the composition of this homily are suggested, on the one hand, by Archbishop Wulfstan's works, in particular *Institutes of Polity*, from which the homily draws part of its material (see Jost 1950: 208–10, and Pons-Sanz 2007b: 22–23), and, on the other hand, by the work of a compiler working in Winchester in the middle of the eleventh century. The latter drew materials from this homily in order to develop two other homilies recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ii.4.6 (see Godden 1975 and Scragg 1977: 210). Regarding the place where the compiler of the homily under analysis was working, Scragg (Scragg 1977: 211) points out that it is difficult to decide between the South-East, Winchester, and Worcester. Yet, none of the three places could be associated with the Scandinavianized areas.

II.176 HomU 29.1 (Nap 36): see below, II.257.3.

II.177 HomU 29.2 (Nap 35): see below, II.257.4.

II.178 HomU 32 (Nap 40) + HomU 34 (Nap 42): Wilcox (Wilcox 1991) has shown that these two homilies, which rely very heavily on HomU 8 (ScraggVerc 2) and the Wulfstanian canon (on which see below, II.257), are likely to have been put together by the same person (cp. Scragg 1979: 249–50). He suggests that the compiler and reviser is likely to have been working in Winchester during the early eleventh century. Given that they are both recorded in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 419, which dates from the first half of the eleventh century (see Ker 1990: no. 68), they are attributed to Group 4. Despite the general derivative character, their uses of OE *lagu* do not rely on

any of the extant Wulfstanian works. Therefore, they are treated independently from the Wulfstanian canon; they may represent familiarity with Wulfstan's phraseology in eleventh-century Anglo-Saxon England (cp. HomU 27 (Nap 30), on which see above, II.175).

II.179 HomU 40 (Nap 50): see below, II.257.5.

II.180 HomU 41 (Nap 51): see below, II.257.6.

II.181 HomU 46 (Nap 57): Even though this homily has sometimes been included in the Wulfstanian canon, it is not generally accepted to have been composed by Wulfstan himself, although its language has been clearly influenced by the Wulfstanian compositions (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 8–10).

II.182 HomU 48 (Nap 59): see below, II.257.7.

II.183 HomU 49 (Nap 60): see below, II.257.8.

II.184 HomU 50 (Nap 61): see below, II.257.9.

II.185 HomU 59 (Nap 37): This homily relies on various Wulfstanian texts (see above, I.39.4.1.C and I.54.7.3.O). There is, however, one context where OE *lagu* is used which cannot be said to be undoubtedly based on Wulfstan's works. Given that the text is recorded in London, British Library, MS Cleopatra B.xiii, a manuscript from the third quarter of the eleventh century which may have been written down in Exeter (see Ker 1990: 144), this usage is included in Group 5. It is not clear where the homily may have been put together.

II.186 HyGl 2 (Milfull): Milfull explains that 'the assumption that the "Durham Hymnal Gloss" was originally produced at Winchester or a centre influenced by Winchester c. 1000 and subsequently revised at Canterbury is supported by the language of the gloss' (Milfull 1996: 70). Given that the hymnal and its gloss were written in Durham, Cathedral Library, MS B.II.32 during the first half of the eleventh century (see Ker 1990: no. 107), the gloss can be assigned to Group 4.

II.187 Inscr 1 (Ok 1): Okasha (Okasha 1971: no. 1) assigns the inscription on the sundial in Aldbrough, East Yorkshire, to the late tenth or early eleventh century.

II.188 Inscr 22 (Ok 64): Okasha (Okasha 1971: no. 64) dates the main inscription on the Kirkdale church, North Riding of Yorkshire, to 1055 x 1065, the period during which Tosti, who is mentioned in that inscription, was Earl of Northumbria (see Watts and Rhatz's comment in L. Watts and others 1997: 51, and R. K. Morris 1998: 191). The sundial inscription may be somewhat earlier because it refers to an earlier church.

II.189 Inscr 52 (Ok 138): Okasha (Okasha 1971: no. 138) assigns this inscription, found in the Old Minster in Winchester, to the late tenth or the eleventh century. Even though the location of the inscription cannot be associated with the Scandinavianized areas, it is interesting to note that the person who is being commemorated is likely to have been of Scandinavian origin or ancestry, *Gunni* being a common Old Norse name (see Okasha 1971: 127). Syrett speculates that he may be the same Gunni who is said to have died in England in Sm 77 (Kinander 1935–61: 197–98), probably while accompanying Cnut's henchman Hakon of Lade, although he admits that this identification 'scarcely stands up to any rigorous examination' (Syrett 2002: 56–57).<sup>16</sup>

II.190 IsidSent (Cornelius): see below, II.224.

II.191 JDay II: Caie suggests that, on the basis of 'metrical "faults", lack of alliteration and linguistic elements', this poem on the Judgement Day should be attributed to the late tenth century (Caie 2000: 10, cp. 47; cp. Hofstetter 1987: 534). Bredehoft (Bredehoft 2005: 10 and 77) is happier to associate it instead with the late tenth or the early eleventh century (cp. A. Fischer 1989: 108). Its place of composition remains unclear, though, because Anglian phonological and lexical features appear with typically West Saxon features (see Caie 2000: 47–48). HomU 26 (Nap 29) includes a prose version of the poem (see Hofstetter 1987: 533–34, and Caie 2000: 22–32).

II.192 LawAGu: This text represents a treaty between the Wessex king Alfred and the Danish leader Guthrum. It is likely to have been drawn up in the 880s (see Kershaw 2000: 46–67, with references). The text, however, is only extant

<sup>16</sup> On another inscription in England which may be attributable to Cnut's followers, see Holman 1996: 41–43.

in the late eleventh-century Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 383 (see Ker 1990: no. 65), where there are two versions (referred to as B and B2 by Liebermann 1903–16). Even though they differ significantly, the B version being fuller, more formal, and possibly ‘closer to the issuing authorities’ (Keynes 1990: 234; cf. Kershaw 2000: 49), they both record the Scandinavian terms referred to here.

II.193 LawAð: see below, II.257.10.

II.194 LawIAs: see below, II.257.11.

II.195 LawIAtr: see above, II.13.1.3.

II.196 LawIIAtr: see above, II.13.1.4.

II.197 LawIIIAtr: see above, II.13.1.5.

II.198 LawV–XAtr: see below, II.257.12.

II.199 LawBecwæð: The text is not easily localized or dated, but Wormald (Wormald 1999: 385) argues in favour of associating it with ‘the tensions over property disposal that inspired laws by Æthelred and Cnut’.

II.200 LawCn 1020: see above, II.14.1.6.

II.201 LawI–IICn: see below, II.257.14.

II.202 LawDuns: Wormald suggests that the most likely time for an Anglo-Welsh agreement of the type represented in this text to have taken place is during ‘Æthelstan’s overpowering negotiations with the “North Welsh” at Hereford c.930’ (Wormald 1999: 382). He hypothesizes that the reference to the twelve *lahmenn* in LawDuns 3.2 may be a later interpolation added when the text was associated with *II Æthelred* (Wormald 1999: 381). Wormald (Wormald 1999: 232–33) puts forward a scenario where the association of the texts could have taken place in Bath, but this remains unclear. Yet, following Wormald’s hypothesis, the reference to *lahmenn* in the text is placed in Group 5.



II.203 LawIVEg: This law-code should be associated with Edgar's reign (959 x 975), probably with the later rather than the earlier end (see Wormald 1999: 442). Wormald suggests that the text, as it stands, 'was directed at the Danelaw, in various parts of which Oslac, Ælfhere and Æthelwine held office' (Wormald 1999: 317).

II.204 LawEGu: see below, II.257.15.

II.205 LawIIEm: *II Edmund* should be assigned to the reign of King Edmund, viz. 939 x 946. It is, however, not clear whether LawIIEm 7–7.3 should also be associated with the initial drafting of the code. Wormald hypothesizes that 'it could be that an originally unconnected piece on a related theme has got tacked on to Edmund's decree' (Wormald 1999: 311); this unconnected piece, like the tract known as *Wergeld*, could be a later text which built on the original decrees in Edmund's code (see Wormald 1999: 377). For the sake of simplicity, though, the whole text is included in Group 2. Nothing in the code suggests that it should be associated with the Scandinavianized areas (see Wormald 1999: 308–12).

II.206 LawEpis: see below, II.257.16.

II.207 LawGepyncðo: see below, II.257.17.

II.208 LawGrið: see below, II.257.18.

II.209 LawHad: see below, II.257.19.

II.210 LawHu: Wormald (Wormald 1999: 378–79) suggests that the *Hundred Ordinance* may date from Edmund's reign (d. 946) or shortly afterwards (cp. Whitelock 1979: 429, who dates it to 939 x 961). Wormald does not rule out that the document may have had an official status or may have derived from a royal code. In any case, it could have been drafted 'for, or by, any single hundred' (Wormald 1999: 378).

II.211 LawMirce: see below, II.257.20.

II.212 LawNorgrið: While this text, which specifies church sanctuaries in Northumbria, has sometimes been attributed to Archbishop Wulfstan of York,

his authorship can be rejected, although the text could easily be attributed to someone very familiar with the language of the Archbishop (see above, 4.3). Given that it is already attested in the part of London, British Library, MS Cotton Nero A.i where Wulfstan's handwriting was identified by Ker (Ker 1971: 321–24, and Ker 1990: no. 164), the text should probably be attributed to the years of his episcopacy.

II.213 LawNorðleod: see below, II.257.21.

II.214 LawNorthu: Even though the wording of the so-called *Northumbrian Priests' Law* has close similarities with the language of Archbishop Wulfstan II of York, it seems more likely that the author was, not Wulfstan himself, but one of his successors to the see of York (see Tenhaken 1979, Wormald 1999: 396–97, and Wormald 2000: 211–13).

II.215 LawOrdal: The dating and origin of this text are highly complex. All we can say about it is that 'it has one post-950 symptom in the word "lage"' (Wormald 1999: 374).

II.216 LawPax: Wormald hypothesizes that *Pax*, like *Walreaf*, 'could well have been added on to the text which the king's agents took northwards with them from his Wantage council [see above, II.13.1.5]. It may be recalled that several clauses in the supposedly main body of the Wantage code itself give exactly this impression of *addenda*' (Wormald 1999: 372). It is only on this speculative basis that the two codes are integrated in the same group as *III Æthelred*, i.e. Group 3.

II.217 LawRect: Harvey (Harvey 1993) explains that *Rectitudines Singularum Personarum* was associated with the tract known as *Gerefa*, initially of a completely different origin, purpose, and date, in the early eleventh century. There have been various attempts to attribute the revision undergone by the texts when they were associated to Archbishop Wulfstan II of York (see Baxter 2004: 165, and Pons-Sanz 2007b: 15–16, with references). However, on the basis of the lack of the diagnostic expressions which characterize Wulfstan's texts and the disagreements between *Gerefa* and the piece on reeves included in *II Polity*, it is better to agree with Wormald that the reviser was likely to be a 'near-contemporary who shared some of the archbishop's ideas, and even a few

of his stylistic mannerisms' (Wormald 2000: 211; cp. Wormald 1999: 387–89). Harvey (Harvey 1993: 13 and 18–21) suggests that all the attestations of *lagu* and its word-field in the text should be associated with the work of the early eleventh-century reviser, not with the mid-tenth-century initial composition of the text in South-West England.

II.218 LawSwer: As noted by Wormald (Wormald 1999: 383–84), the code represents a collection of oaths for various occasions, which suggests that they are likely to have different dates (and, possibly, dialectal origins). The date when the whole text was put together remains uncertain; all we can say is that 'making a group of these formulae was prompted by the amount of written law put into currency about the processes involved from 900 onwards' (Wormald 1999: 384). Wormald (Wormald 1999: Table 3.1) tentatively assigns the text to a period similar to that of *II Æthelred* and this is the date given here (i.e. it is placed in Group 3). However, we should remember that there is no certainty about it.

II.219 LawWal: see above, II.216.

II.220 LawWif: The place of composition of *Wifmannes Bewedding* is unknown. With regard to its date, Wormald suggests that its contents fit best 'Wulfstan's era' (Wormald 1999: 386), as represented by the Archbishop's homiletic and legal texts (cp. below, II.257); this is the reason for its tentative inclusion in Group 4.

II.221 LawWlLad: see above, II.17.1.24.

II.222 Lev: see above, II.5.

II.223 \* (Li) + Name 1.2 (HarmD 22) + DurRitGl + HyGl 1: The Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels are likely to have been composed c. 950 close to Durham (see above, 4.2.3). This dating relies on Aldred being as well the glossator of the Durham Ritual, whose colophon was written in 970 by Aldred the Provost. Although single authorship is not beyond doubt (see above, 4.3.1), the glosses are treated here together because there is no strong evidence against it either and this is the generally accepted view. Yet we should bear in mind that Aldred may have relied on a number of unidentified glosses when carrying out his work (see above, II.168).

II.224 LibSc + IsidSent (Cornelius): The Old English glosses to Defensor's *Liber scintillarum* are only fully recorded in London, British Library, MS Royal 7 C.iv. Ker (Ker 1990: no. 256) dates the hand which wrote them to c. 1050. The lexical choices in the text are clearly associated with those in the Canterbury glosses to the *Regularis concordia* (see below, II.254), which suggests that they are likely to have the same origin or to derive from an area under Canterbury influence (see Kornexl 1993: ccxxxiii, with references). On the basis of palaeographical and linguistic evidence, Cornelius (Cornelius 1995: 122) concludes that the Old English glosses to Isidore's *De vitiis et peccatis* (= IsidSent (Cornelius)) are attributable to the same glossator who is responsible for the glosses to the *Liber scintillarum*. Accordingly, the two sets of glosses are dealt with together.

II.225 Lit 5.12.2: This text is a rubric in the order for visiting and anointing the sick in the missal of Robert of Jumièges. Ker (Ker 1990: no. 377) dates the inscription between 1044, the year of Robert's consecration as Bishop of London, and 1051, when he was translated to Canterbury. He explains that the hand can be identified with that of Cambridge, Trinity College, MS B.10.4, a Canterbury product (see also H. A. Wilson 1896: xxiv–xxvi and lxviii).

II.226 LS 9 (Giles) + LS 29 (Nicholas): These two Old English texts are only extant in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 303, to which Treharne (Treharne 1997: 19–21 and 25–28) assigns a date in 'the first-half of the twelfth century, closer to 1150 than to an earlier date in that century' (Treharne 1997: 1) and a likely origin in Rochester (cp. Ker 1990: no. 57, Laing 1993: 23, and Treharne 2000: 28–31). She explains that the texts in this manuscript are most probably copies, not the original translations (Treharne 1997: 72–78); on the basis of lexical and stylistic features as well as historical information, she attributes the latter to a single person working at the end of the eleventh century (cp. Hofstetter 1987: 245). Although the Norse-derived terms recorded in the texts seem to suggest that they originate from an area in or near the Danelaw, this suggestion cannot be strongly supported (see above, 4.2.5); therefore, the dialectal origin of the texts has to remain undecided.

II.227 LS 28 (Neot): The outer limits for the composition of this text, the only extant Old English life of the Cornish hermit St Neot, are, on the one hand, the date of composition of one of its sources, *Vita prima Sancti Neoti*, which Lapidge (Lapidge 1984: lxxxii and xcvi) assigns to the mid-eleventh century,

and, on the other hand, the mid-twelfth century, the date of the only manuscript where it is recorded, viz. London, British Library, MS Cotton Vespasian D.xiv (on which see below, IV.1.13). Richards would like to attribute this text to ‘the middle of the eleventh century, surely before 1066’ (M. Richards 1981: 263). However, Lapidge argues that there are no substantial reasons for that dating and points out instead that, on linguistic grounds, ‘a date in the first half of the twelfth century would seem most likely’ (Lapidge 1984: cxvi and n. 116). There are no clear indications about where the *Life* may have been composed; Doble (Doble 1929: 14, n. 1) and Richards (M. Richards 1981: 263–64) argue in favour of Croyland Abbey, Lincolnshire, as its place of composition, while Handley (Handley 1984: 249) suggests Canterbury instead (cp. Hofstetter 1987: 244 n. 2).

II.228 LS 29 (Nicholas): see above, II.226.

II.229 Mald: The date of the composition of the *Battle of Maldon* and its dialectal origin are highly disputed topics amongst scholars. Dates ranging from a year close to 991, when the actual battle took place, to the 1020s or 1030s have been proposed, while the poem has been attributed to various dialectal areas (see above, 4.2.4, and Pons-Sanz 2008: 441–44, with references).

II.230 Med 5.8 (Cockayne): This text is recorded in London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius C.ii. Ker (Ker 1990: no. 219, item 2) dates its writing to the second half of the eleventh century and does not specify any house where the manuscript may have been written. The origin of the recipe is otherwise also unknown.

II.231 Name 1.2 (HarmD 22): see above, II.223.

II.232 OccGl 28 (Nap): Even though most of the glosses to Ælfric Bata’s and an anonymous colloquy in Oxford, St John’s College, MS 154 should be attributed to the early part of the eleventh century, the rendering of L *dicione* (co. L *dicio* ‘control, dominion, sovereignty’) with OE ‘lage’ in OccGl 28 (Nap) 19 should be attributed to the later part of the eleventh century (see Ker 1990: no. 362).<sup>17</sup> The manuscript has Durham provenance, but it is not clear where the gloss would have been added.

<sup>17</sup> On the meaning of OE *lagu* in this context, cp. *MED*: s.v. *laue*, sense 6.a.

II.233 OccGl 45.1.2 (Meritt): On the date and dialectal origin of these glosses to Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum*, see above, 2.4.1.A.

II.234 Prog 5.1 (Warn): Liuzza (Liuzza 2001: 184) explains that this prognostic, recorded in London, British Library, MS Cotton Vespasian D.xiv (on which see below, IV.1.13), is closely related to two other prognostics, viz. Prog 3.9 (Först) and Prog 6.4 (Cockayne), recorded in London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A.iii (s. xi; see Ker 1990: no. 186) and Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 115 (s. xi<sup>2</sup>; see Ker 1990: no. 332), respectively (cp. Förster 1903: 347–49). It may therefore be the case that the prognostic under consideration should also be attributed to the eleventh century and that is the reason for its inclusion in Group 5. Admittedly, this attribution is very difficult to prove, though.

II.235 ProspGl: Toth (Toth 1984: 6) assigns the glosses to Prosper's *Epi-grammata* and *Versus ad coniugem* in London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A.vii to the first half of the eleventh century (cp. Ker 1990: no. 189). The centre of origin of the glosses is unknown, although Toth (Toth 1984: 14, 20) points out that they show a majority of late West Saxon features together with some early West Saxon and non-West Saxon features (particularly Anglian). This, together with the mistakes included in the glosses, suggests that they are likely to be a copy of an earlier original.

II.236 PrudGl 1 (Meritt): The Old English glosses to Prudentius's works in the Canterbury manuscript Boulogne-sur-Mer, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 189 were written during the first half of the eleventh century (see Ker 1990: no. 7). Their vocabulary associates them with other eleventh-century glosses from Canterbury (see Kornexl 1993: ccxxxiii, with references), although their exact origin remains unclear.<sup>18</sup>

II.237 Rec 2.3 (Earle)\*: These Bath manumissions are said to have taken place during the lifetime of Abbot Ælfsige, who died in 1087. The texts are in the main part of Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 111, but originally belonged to Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 140. It is likely that these manumissions were copied down not much after they took place because Ker

<sup>18</sup> Meritt says, very broadly, that they are 'of English provenience' (Meritt 1959: ix).

(Ker 1990: no. 35) assigns the writing of most of the manumissions in these codices to the second half of the eleventh century or the twelfth century.

II.238 Rec 4 (Först) \*: Förster (Förster 1930: 82) suggests that most of the manumissions in the Bodmin Gospels should be assigned to the second half of the tenth century; however, Ker (Ker 1990: no. 126) dates nos XXX, XXXI, and XXXIII to the second half of the eleventh century.

II.239 Rec 5.3 (RobApp II 8): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 501) explains that this document, which was entered in Cambridge, Pembroke College, MS 83 around the middle of the twelfth century, is difficult to date and localize. However, the presence of particular Norse-derived terms in the text (see above, 3.4.2.8.C, 3.4.2.9.A, and 3.4.2.14.A) and its context in the manuscript suggest that it is likely to originate in a Scandinavianized area (cp. Ker 1990: no. 76). Robertson suggests that, in its current form, it is clearly a post-Conquest document.

II.240 Rec 5.4 (Rob 104): These surveys of food-rents, charitable gifts, etc. from the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds are extant in the local manuscript Oxford, Corpus Christi College, MS 197 (see Douglas 1928: 376). Lowe (Lowe 2008: 54–55) has identified six main hands for these memoranda, dating from c. 1066 to c. 1150; the texts recording the Norse-derived terms discussed in this book are associated with her Hand a (from the mid-eleventh century) and Hand b (from the second half of the eleventh century; cp. Douglas 1928: 376 n. 2, and Robertson 1939: 440). Even though the texts clearly have different authors and have been written at different times, they are treated together because of their similar origin and scholarly tradition.

II.241 Rec 6.10 (Stanley): see above, II.15.2.6.

II.242 Rec 8.2 (RobApp I 2): This text records a lease of lands by Walcher, bishop of Durham from 1071 to 1080; these dates would provide us with the *termini post quem* and *ad quem* for the document (see Robertson 1939: 480). It is recorded in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 183 by a contemporary hand who was probably working in Durham (see Ker 1990: no. 42).

II.243 Rec 9.1 (RobApp II 9): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 503) suggests that notes on the assignments of property to Thorney Abbey recorded in this text are likely to have been made soon after the foundation of the abbey in



972, while Skeat (Skeat 1902: 13) dates the extant text to the first half of the eleventh century.

II.244 Rec 9.4 (Thorpe): These regulations for the thanes' gild in Cambridge are recorded in London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius B.v, a detached leaf from Cambridge, University Library, MS Kk.1.24, which is a gospel-book probably from Ely (see Ker 1990: no. 22). The text is written in a hand from the late tenth century, and it seems to have been included after a grant by a certain Ælfhelm which can be dated to 970 x 999 (see Whitelock 1979: 603; cf. Westlake 1919: 5, who assigns the document to the eleventh century).

II.245 Rec 10.1 (RobApp I 1): This list of gifts by Bishop Leofric of Exeter is likely to have been recorded soon after the donation was made. Robertson (Robertson 1939: 473) dates the donation to 1069 x 1072. The list can be found in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Auct. D.2.16 and in the so-called Exeter Book (viz. Exeter, Cathedral Library, MS 3,501). As noted by Förster (Förster 1932a: 12), the two entries are likely to have been written down in the last quarter of the eleventh century. Förster (Förster 1932a: 11) points out that the reference to the bearskins is likely to be a later interpolation. However, in the two manuscripts it is written by the respective hand which wrote the record of the donation; this would suggest that the addition could also be associated with the last quarter of the eleventh century.

II.246 Rec 10.2 (Hickes): This list of guild members of Woodbury is one of the documents included in the Exeter Book during the twelfth century (see below, II.247). Despite its late attestation, it may be the case that the document should be dated to 1072 x 1103 on the basis that it mentions Bishop Osbern of Exeter and presents his actions in the present perfect rather than the past (cp. Rec 10.6.2 (Dickins-Earle) 18; see Westlake 1919: 4, and Förster 1932b: 44 n. 2, and below, II.247).

II.247 Rec 10.6.2 (Dickins-Earle) \*: Förster (Förster 1933b: 44) explains that the legal records in fols 4–7 of the Exeter Book were written in Exeter around the second quarter of the eleventh century (cp. Ker 1990: nos 20, item 13, and 116). Förster characterizes their language as belonging to 'a state of transition, when Old English phonology and inflection had largely given way to Middle English usage' (Förster 1933b: 45). In a survey on the date of the records,

Rose-Troup (Rose-Troup 1937) suggested that the texts which the *OEC* refers to as Rec 10.6.2 (Dickins-Earle) 1, 12, 16, and 19 can be associated with the period *c.* 1090 x 1100, while Rec 10.6.2 (Dickins-Earle) 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, and 11 should rather be associated with the second quarter of the twelfth century. The reliability of her results is not beyond doubt, though. Dickins points out that ‘the evidence, as far as it goes, points to a date for the original document [of Rec 10.6.2 (Dickins-Earle) 1] a good deal nearer to 1133 than to *c.* 1090’ (Dickins 1950: 367). These texts, therefore, can be said to be on the border between the corpus of the present study and the texts included in Appendix IV. However, given that they are likely to have been composed before 1150 and that, accordingly, they are missing from Laing’s catalogue (Laing 1993), they are included in the main body of the study. Since the records were kept in the same place and within a small range of years, they are treated as a group.

II.248 Rec 15 (Birch 106): This text is the Old English version of an eighth-century grant of privileges by Pope Sergius I to Abbot Aldhelm and the Abbeys of Malmesbury and Frome, Wiltshire (see Birch 1885–93: 1, 152 and 154). It is recorded in a hand of the mid-eleventh century in London, British Library, MS Cotton Otho C.i, fol. 68, a manuscript which may have Malmesbury provenance (Ker 1990: no. 181, item 2). Indeed, given the interest of the two abbeys in Pope Sergius’s grant, the translation of the text is likely to have taken place in either of the two houses.

II.249 Rec 23.3 (RobApp I 6): Robertson dates this document, which records payments made by the church of Worcester to William I, ‘perhaps about 1084’ (Robertson 1939: 493). The text was copied in the so-called Hemming’s cartulary (*viz.* London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A.xiii), which was written towards the end of the eleventh century (see Ker 1948, and Ker 1990: no. 190, art. B.a).

II.250 Rec 23.4 (Ker): These eleventh-century dues are recorded in the part of the Worcester codex London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A.xiii which can be attributed to the first half of the eleventh century (see Ker 1948: 50–51 and 74, and Ker 1990: no. 190).

II.251 Rec 24.1 (Rob 84): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 414) suggests a date *c.* 1030 for this record of the types of tenure among church lands in Yorkshire.

II.252 Rec 24.4 (Stevenson): As noted by Stevenson (W. H. Stevenson 1912: 11), the Ælfric whose sureties are named in the text may be Archbishop Ælfric of York (1023–51), although this is not beyond doubt (see Björkman 1913: 3–4). The *terminus ad quem* of the text is marked by the date when it was written in the York Gospels, i.e. the end of the eleventh century or the beginning of the twelfth century (see W. H. Stevenson 1912: 11, and Ker 1990: no. 402, item f).

II.253 Rec 26.4 (RobApp I 3): Robertson (Robertson 1939: 481) assigns this document, the Northamptonshire geld roll, to the second half of the eleventh century, although its exact date is not clear. Given that Northamptonshire lay in the boundary between the Danelaw and Mercian law (see Stafford 1985: 115, and Hart 1992: 10–11 and n. 21), the text is not associated with either the Scandinavianized or the non-Scandinavianized areas.

II.254 RegCGI (Kornexl): Kornexl (Kornexl 1993: cxxxviii, clxxxiv, ccxi–ccxiii, and ccxxxii–ccxxxvi) suggests that the interlinear glosses to the *Regularis concordia*, recorded in London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A.iii, are likely to originate from Canterbury in the first half of the eleventh century (cp. Ker 1990: no. 186).

II.255 Scrib 3.1 (Ker): The scribbles containing two drinking formulas in Arras, Bibliothèque municipale, MS 764 are difficult to date: Ker (Ker 1990: no. 4) assigns them to ‘s. x (?)’, while Förster (Förster 1932b: 24 n. 107) dates them to c. 1080. According to Ker, they could have been written by someone working in England or in the Continent.

II.256 StWulf: Pelteret (Pelteret 1990: 121–22, no. 147) dates this text, by Thomas, prior of Worcester Cathedral, recording how (St) Wulfstan became bishop of Worcester, to 1096 x 4 October 1113.

II.257 WCorp: Amongst the works attributed to Archbishop Wulfstan II of York (not to be confused with St Wulfstan, who was Bishop of Worcester from 1062 to 1095), we find homiletic and non-homiletic texts (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: ch. 1, and Wormald 2004). Most of his texts would have been written from 1002, when he was appointed Archbishop of York and Bishop of

Worcester, to 1023, the year of his death (see also Godden 2004 and Pons-Sanz 2007d). Even though there have been various attempts to associate Wulfstan's use of Norse-derived terms with his Scandinavianized northern see or with a possible Anglian origin, extant evidence does not allow us to associate his works in general with the Scandinavianized areas (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: ch. 7). This can only be done for specific texts. The texts recording Norse-derived words which are covered here by the umbrella abbreviation WCorp are the following:

II.257.1 ChronD (Cubbin) 959 (= ChronE (Irvine) 959 = ChronF (Baker) 958) + ChronD (Cubbin) 975: Wulfstan's authorship of the poems on Edgar included in these annals is not beyond doubt (see Pons-Sanz 2007c). However, given that their language shows a clear connection with the Wulfstanian works, they are included here for pragmatic purposes.

II.257.2 HomU 21 (Nap 1): The outer limits for the composition of this homily are presented by, on the one hand, the Wulfstanian canon, on which it partially relies (Jost 1950: 184–87), and, on the other hand, the earliest manuscript where it is recorded, London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius A.xiii, which dates from the first half of the eleventh century (see Ker 1990: no. 190). The presence of some additions by Wulfstan to the version recorded in the aforementioned manuscript (see Ker 1971: 325–26) suggests that the compiler may have been someone in the Archbishop's close circle. In fact, Wilcox (Wilcox 1987: 133–36, Wilcox 1992: 200–01 and 204–05) argues in favour of incorporating the homily into the Archbishop's canon (cp. Scragg 1979: 253–54). Thus, for the purpose of this study, the linguistic features of this homily are associated with those of the archbishop's canon.

II.257.3 HomU 29.1 (Nap 36)

II.257.4 HomU 29.2 (Nap 35)

II.257.5 HomU 40 (Nap 50)

II.257.6 HomU 41 (Nap 51)

II.257.7 HomU 48 (Nap 59)

II.257.8 HomU 49 (Nap 60)

II.257.9 HomU 50 (Nap 61)

II.257.10 LawAð: Even though it is not clear whether the whole text can be attributed to Wulfstan (see Rabin 2010 for a recent discussion), the reference to OE *lagu* in LawAð 2 is likely to be his. It may have been inserted as part of the Archbishop's revision of the text to incorporate it in his compilation on status (see Bethurum 1950: 459, and Wormald 1999: 391–92).

II.257.11 LawIAs: On Wulfstan's revision of *I Æthelstan*, see Wormald (Wormald 1999: 295 and 302)

II.257.12 LawV-XAttr

II.257.13 LawCn 1020: see above, II.14.1.6.

II.257.14 LawI-II Cn

II.257.15 LawEGu: As argued by Whitelock (Whitelock 1941), Wulfstan is likely to have drafted this text with his northern (i.e. York) rather than his southern (i.e. Worcester) see in mind.

II.257.16 LawEpisc

II.257.17 LawGepyncðo

II.257.18 LawGrið

II.257.19 LawHad

II.257.20 LawMirce: This text belongs to Wulfstan's compilation on status (see Bethurum 1950). Even though the text cannot be fully associated with Wulfstan (see Wormald 1999: 391–93), the references to OE *lagu* are likely to be attributable to the Archbishop.

II.257.21 LawNorðleod: This is one of the texts included in Wulfstan's compilation on status (see Bethurum 1950). Even though part of this text can be attributed to the Archbishop (LawNorðleod 5 and 7–12), Wormald explains that other parts are clearly old fashioned because the text mentions the wergild of the 'norðleoda cynges' (LawNorðleod 1), but there was not a Northumbrian king after 952 (Wormald 1999: 393). Yet the presence of OE *bold* suggests that, in its current state, it postdates the arrival of the Scandinavian newcomers. Since it is not clear when the reference to the wergild of a *bold* would have made it into the document, but the existence of this rank is mentioned in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* in the first half of the tenth century (see above, 3.4.2.6.A.4), the use of the Norse-derived term is associated with this period for the sake of convenience. The possibility that the use of the term should be associated with a slightly earlier or a later period cannot be discounted, though.

II.257.22 WÆLet 2: The *OEC* does not include two texts attributable to Wulfstan: Cnut's 1018 legislation (edited by Kennedy 1983) and Wulfstan's version of Ælfric's first pastoral letter to him in Old English, recorded in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 201 (edited by Fehr 1966: 68–145, version D). The latter is here referred to as WÆLet 2 on the basis that the Ælfrician text is abbreviated as ÆLet 2 in the *OEC*. Most of the Norse-derived terms attested in these texts are also recorded in other Wulfstanian compositions; therefore, for the sake of simplicity, no reference

to these occurrences is made in Appendix I. WÆLet 2 is, however, the only Wulfstanian text recording OE *lablic*; accordingly, this usage is recorded in 3.3.4 and in Appendix I.

II.257.23 WCan 1.1.2 (Fowler)

II.257.24 WHom \*: For a recent discussion of the date of *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, Wulfstan's best known homily (viz. WHom 20.1, WHom 20.2, and WHom 20.3), see Keynes (Keynes 2007: 203–13, with references).

II.257.25 WPol 2.1.1 (Jost)

II.257.26 WPol 2.1.2 (Jost)

II.257.27 WPol 2.2.1 (Jost)

II.257.28 WPol 6.1 (Jost)

II.257.29 WPol 6.2 (Jost)

II.258 \* (WSCp): Even though Liuzza argues in favour of multiple authorship of the so-called West Saxon Gospels (cp. Kozuka 2006), he suggests that 'there is no reason to suspect that the translators worked in isolation from one another, at widely separate intervals or in different locations. Evidence for the influence of one gospel upon another [...] suggests rather a degree of cooperation between the translators' (Liuzza 1994–2000: II, 119; cp. Miranda-García and others 2008). Accordingly, their linguistic practices are clustered here as representing a single entity for pragmatic purposes. Given that the earliest manuscript recording the text of the gospels, viz. New Haven, Beinecke Library, MS Beinecke 578, could be assigned to the end of the tenth century or the beginning of the eleventh century (see Ker 1990: no. 1, and Liuzza 1994–2000: I, xlii), the texts have been included in Group 3 (cp. Lenker 1997: 43). Regarding their place of origin, Liuzza (Liuzza 1994–2000: II, 49 and ch. 4) suggests a possible Canterbury provenance. On the use of more Norse-derived terms in manuscripts of the gospels written during the Middle English period, see Fischer (A. Fischer 1996: 35 and n. 20, and below, IV.1.16 and IV.3.B).





## TERMS AND STRUCTURES WHICH ARE MORE LIKELY TO BE NATIVE

**T**his appendix records the terms and structures for which Norse derivation has been suggested but which are here considered to be native on the basis of the extant evidence. The appendix aims at being as comprehensive as possible, cataloguing the terms that have been discussed in studies published since the beginning of the twentieth century. However, given the aforementioned trend in some scholarly quarters to identify Norse derivation whenever an Old English word poses a problem that can, to some extent, be solved or at least palliated by bringing Norse influence into the discussion (see above, 1.4), it may be the case that the appendix does not discuss every single term which has been identified as Norse-derived, particularly if the word is discussed in passing in works which do not focus on Norse influence on (Old) English.

The terms analysed below are divided into the same sections as those included in Chapter 2, i.e. according to the main evidence brought forward in favour of their Norse derivation. They are arranged in alphabetical order within each section.

### *III.1. Phonological Evidence*

#### **III.1.1. PGmc \*/ai/ > OE /a:/ vs OIc /ei/ (cp. above, 2.2.1.1)**

(A) OE 'ðæge': This form, attested in LS 24 (MichaelTristr) 70, Jn (WSCp) 4.40, etc., has sometimes been interpreted as a very early representation of the Norse-derived Middle English pronoun for the 3rd person pl. (< the Viking

Age Norse pronoun attested, for instance, as **þair**, nom. sing., in DR 29; see Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 54–55; cp. OIc *þeir* ‘they’, cf. OE *ðā*, see below), where <æg> is supposed to represent the Norse diphthong and <e> is identified as the plural ending (see Förster 1941, Förster 1942, A. Campbell 1959: §713, Tristram 1970: 271, and Howe 1996: 156; for an almost complete summary of scholarship on the origin of the form, see Morse-Gagné 2003: 214–15). This suggestion, however, is not commonly accepted because the forms agree in use with those of the Old English demonstrative pronoun *ðā* (acc. fem. sing., and nom. / acc. pl.) rather than with those of the Norse pronoun (see Hofstetter 1987: 563–67, and Morse-Gagné 2003: 216–19). OE ‘ðæge’ is therefore better understood as a variant of OE *ðā* (see Hofmann 1955: §328, Peters 1981: 121, Dance 2003: 456–57, and Morse-Gagné 2003: ch. 6). As suggested by Dance (Dance 2003: 457), <ge> may represent an analogical extension (cp. OE *hī* vs *hīe*, sometimes spelt <hige>), or a ‘case of diphthongization of a heavily stressed vowel in particularly emphatic circumstances’ (cp. Dance 2003: 289–98).

### III.1.2. The Reflex of i-umlauted PGmc \*/au/: WS /i:ə, y:/, nWS /e:/ vs OIc /ey/ (cp. above, 2.2.1.3)

(A) OE *fēsian* / *fȳsian* ‘to drive away’: Luick (Luick 1964: §384.4) would like to see the effects of the monophthongization of the Norse diphthong (cp. OIc *\*feysa*) in these verbs. However, as I have argued elsewhere (see Pons-Sanz 2006b), there is nothing in the phonological structure of these forms to suggest that they are Norse-derived.

### III.1.3. PGmc \*/e:1/ > NWGmc \*/a:/ > WS and Kt. /æ:/, Angl. /e:/ or /o:/ when followed by a nasal vs OIc /a:/ (cp. above, 2.2.1.4)

(A) OE *brād*: Björkman suggests that the adjective in the phrase ‘of bradre pannan’, which glosses L *de sartagine* (cp. L *sartago* ‘frying pan’) in ClGI 1 (Stryker) 1787, and is the determinant in the compound OE *brāðhlāf*, which glosses L *paximatum* (cp. L *paxamadium* ‘a baked loaf of some sort, biscuit’), should be associated with the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *bráð* ‘raw meat’ instead of the Old English cognate *bræd* ‘roasted or grilled meat’ (Björkman 1900–02: 88–89; cf. the DOE: s.v. *brædepanne*). However, the same vowel appears in CorpGl 2 (Hessels) 3.199, where ‘braad ponne’ glosses L *cartago* (for L *sartago*; cp. Hessels 1890: xxiii, and Cooke 1993: 351). This is a context where we would hardly expect to find a Norse-derived term. Therefore,

the vowel in these terms could be associated instead with OE *brād* 'broad' (cp. OE 'breitibannæ', with OHG *breit* 'broad' as the determinant, which glosses L *sartago* in ErfGl 1 (Pheifer) 885).

(B) OE 'ia' ('yes'): Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 109), following Kluge (Kluge 1901: 933), suggests that 'ia', attested as part of the expression OE *cweðan gēa wið* in ChronD (Cubbin) 1067.23–24 (on which see below, III.4.J) and in Gen 27.24, could be Norse-derived because it seems to represent OE *gǣ* 'yes' as opposed to WS *gēa* (< OE \**gǣ*) or Angl. *gē* (cp. OIc *já* 'yes'; cp. the OED 1989: s.v. *yea*, adv.(n.)). However, as noted by Björkman himself, the form under discussion may simply represent an unstressed by-form of the adverb (cp. Go. *jai* 'yes' vs *ja* id.). The forms attested in Middle English texts, viz. '3o' in the south and '3a' in the north, seem to suggest that, at some point, the vowel was lengthened again (see Jordan 1974: §44). This lengthening could have taken place by native means or following the influence of the Norse cognate, the two possibilities not being mutually exclusive. However, as far as the form attested in Old English texts is concerned, nothing suggests that it should be analysed as Norse-derived as opposed to native (cp. de Vries 1961: s.v. *já*).

(C) OE *nāmræde*: This compound is only recorded once in the OEC; it glosses L *litterature* (cp. L *litteratura* 'learning, erudition; the science of language, writing') in ClGl 1 (Stryker) 3518. Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 83), Rynell (Rynell 1948: 28), and Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: 311) would like to interpret the determinant as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *nám* 'learning, study'). Accordingly, the presence of /a:/ in front of the nasal instead of the expected /o:/ would be a clear indication of its Norse origin. However, things are not as straightforward. As pointed out by Rusche (Rusche 1996: 339 n. to L 34), the lemma derives from the following context in Aldhelm's *Prosa de virginitate*: 'et aethralis litteraturae albo descriptos' ('and inscribed in the register of celestial writing') (Ehwald 1961: 275.11). Meritt (Meritt 1947: 423 and Meritt 1954: 78) notes that L *album* means, amongst other things, 'a list of names, register' (cp. Lewis and Short 1879: s.v. *albus*, sense III). Thus, it is glossed as OE 'nombec' (ClGl 1 (Stryker) 85) and 'nombred' (ClGl 3 (Quinn) 853) ('register of names') in its two occurrences in the Cleopatra Glossaries, both of which derive from the same context as L *litterature* (see Rusche 1996: 163 n. to A85, and 494 n. to 520). It is therefore best to follow Meritt in suggesting that the determinant of the compound should be equated with OE *nama* 'name',<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> On the alternation between <a> and <o> to represent PGmc \*/a/ in front of a nasal, see Kittlick 1998.

whereas the determinatum is OE *ræden* ‘condition, terms, stipulation, estimation’. The compound, then, seems to mean ‘naming, matter of names’, rather than ‘learning, erudition’.

**III.1.4. PGmc \*/a/ > OE /æ/ (/æɑ/ because of palatal diphthongization; see Hogg 1992: §§5.49–52) vs OIc /a/ (cp. above, 2.2.1.7)**

(A) ‘-gate’: Treharne (Treharne 1997: 73, and 122 n. to l. 377) suggests that OE ‘portgate’ in LS 29 (Nicholas) 377 is of Norse origin. She does not explain why, but we may assume that the reason lies in the presence of /a/ instead of the expected /æ/ or /æɑ/ in the determinatum (cp. OE ‘portgate’ in *ÆCHom* I, 33 459.6; cp. above, 2.2.1.7 and Hogg 1992: §§5.49–55). However, the *OED* (*OED* 1989: s.v. *gate*, n.<sup>1</sup>) explains that in late Old English there is a tendency towards the simplification of the paradigm of OE *geat* ‘gate, door’ by analogy, according to which we find forms like ‘gate’ (e.g. *HomS* 24 (ScraggVerc 1) 23, Lk (WSCp) 7.12) or ‘geatum’ (e.g. *Or* 5 3.117.10). Thus, the only indication of a possible Norse origin for the determinatum of the compound lies in the fact that, given that it appears in the phrase ‘at þære portgate’ (cp. ‘to þære gate’ in LS 29 (Nicholas) 154), it seems to be assigned a feminine rather than a neuter gender (cp. OIc *gata* ‘path, way, road’). Yet, Treharne (Treharne 1997: 69) points out herself that confusion of gender is attested in other cases in her two texts.

**III.1.5. PGmc \*/ax/ and \*/arC/ > OE /æax/ (or /æ:ɑ/) and /æarC/ vs OIc \*/ax/ (or /a:/) and /arC/ (cp. above, 2.2.1.8)**

(A) OE *ar(e)we* ‘arrow’: Holthausen (Holthausen 1934: s.v. *arwe*), Goossens (Goossens 1974: 65), and Kniezsa (Kniezsa 1994: 241) would like to interpret this term, recorded, amongst other places, in *AldV* 1 (Goossens) 4119 and *ChronE* (Irvine) 1083.18, as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *or* ‘arrow’, pl. *orvar*). This etymological analysis may be based on lack of breaking of the root vowel. However, this term could be easily explained as an example of the so-called *combinative breaking* (see A. Campbell 1959: §144 n. 1, and Hogg 1992: §5.29 n. 4; cp. Björkman 1900–02: 227, Peters 1981: 102, and Pons-Sanz 2011: 40). Native derivation would be fully in keeping with the dialectal distribution of the term in Old English texts.

(B) Nb. *arg* ‘adulterer, luxurious’ and *argscipe* ‘adultery’: Ross (Ross 1982: 197) suggests that this adjective, which glosses L *peccatrix* ‘sinner’ in *MtGl* (Gl) 12.31 and *MkGl* (Li) 8.38 (cp. <arognisse>, with epenthetic vowel, in *MkGl*

(Ru) 8.38; see Hogg 1992: §6.36), and this noun, which glosses L *adulterium* 'adultery' in JnHeadGl (Li) 20, should be identified as Norse-derived terms (cp. OIc *argr* 'emasculate, effeminate'; cf. OE *earg*). However, it seems better to agree with Hogg (Hogg 1992: §5.20 n. 5) that these terms represent, like others in the Northumbrian glosses, the effects of combinative breaking outside its normal limits (cp. Nb. <darr> for OE *dear* 'I dare', in LiEpis (Skeat) 3).

(C) OE *balc* 'a ridge between two furrows': This term, which glosses L *porca* 'sow' in AntGl 4 (Kindschi) 535, has been interpreted as a possible Norse-derived loan-word based on the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *balkr* / *bqlkr* 'beam, bar, partition, division' (see Holthausen 1934: s.v. *balc*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *bqlkr*, and the OED 1989: s.v. *balk*, *baulk*, n.<sup>1</sup>). However, this term should be associated with OE *balca* 'strip of unploughed land between two fields; instrument of punishment', which is already attested in the Old English Boethius (Bo 16.37.8; cp. the DOE: s.v. *balc*, *balca*, *balce*). Lack of breaking in these terms is commonly explained as a result of the fact that a middle vowel standing between the liquid and the velar prevented breaking from taking place and was later syncopated (i.e. < PGmc \**balukōn*; see A. Campbell 1959: §§389, and 397 n. 1, K. Brunner 1965: §§85 Anm. 3, and 159 Anm. 8, Peters 1981: 102–03, and Hogg 1992: §6.67 n. 2). Alternatively, it may be the case that, as suggested by Lucas (Lucas 1970: 304–05), the late Old English form under consideration developed as a blend of OE *balc* 'something spread over, a covering?' (see below, III.4.D) and *balca*. In any case, there is no need to analyse this term as Norse-derived (cp. Wood 1913: 4 no. 7, the MED: s.v. *balke*, the DOE: s.v. *balc*, *balca*, *balce*, and the VEPN: s.v. *balca*).

(D) Nb. *slā*: Besides its dialectal distribution, lack of breaking in Nb. *slā*(*n*) (cf. WS *slēan* 'to strike') has sometimes been considered as evidence of its Norse origin (cp. OIc *slá* 'to smite, strike'; see e.g. Björkman 1900–02: 101, and Ross 1937: 133).<sup>2</sup> Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §249) has rejected this possibility by suggesting instead that this form arose as a result of analogy with other strong Class VI verbs (cp. Peters 1981: 116, and Pons-Sanz 2000: 111–12). However, it is also likely that this verb represents an example of the fact that restoration of /a/ seems to have occurred earlier than breaking in the North-East (see above, 2.2.1.8).

<sup>2</sup> Ross (Ross 1937: 133) explains that the spelling <aa> seems to indicate disyllabic pronunciation (cp. Ross 1937: 157), which is in keeping with the fact that, despite having lost medial /x/ c. 500, the verb is frequently scanned as disyllabic in the oldest skaldic poetry. Yet Barnes explains that in Old Norse metrics a long syllable is generally equivalent of two short ones (Barnes 1999: 13).

(E) OE *(ge)sparrian*: Holthausen (Holthausen 1934: s.v. *gesparrian*) and Serjeantson (Serjeantson 1935: 68) would interpret OE ‘gesparrado’, which glosses L *clauso* (cp. L *clausus* ‘locked’) in MtGl (Li) 6.6, as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *sparra* ‘to furnish a house with spars’; cp. Pons-Sanz 2000: 102, and Pons-Sanz 2004). The reason for this seems to be lack of breaking in the root vowel and the dialectal distribution of the verb. However, this term, like OE ‘bisparrade’ / ‘besparrade’, which glosses L *oppilate* (cp. L *oppilare* ‘to stop up, shut up’) in CorpGl 2 (Hessels) 13.221 = ClGl 1 (Stryker) 4500, is likely to represent instead the effects of combinative breaking (see Hogg 1992: §5.29 and n. 3; cp. Bammesberger 1979: 121–22, and Peters 1981: 110).

(F) OE *targa* ‘small shield’: This noun has been frequently associated with OIc *targa* ‘target, small round shield’ (e.g. Peters 1981: 95, and Kisbye 1982a: 50). Lack of breaking and the late attestation of the term (it is only recorded in eleventh-century glossaries) may argue in favour of this possibility. It is, however, more likely that the term represents the first attested case of the influence of the OFr. *targe* ‘light shield’ word-field (itself of Norse origin) on English (see Pons-Sanz 2011: 39–40, with references).<sup>3</sup>

(G) OE ‘ryðrenan’: see above, note 63 in Chapter 2.

### III.1.6. PGmc \*/g/ and /k/ in contact with a front vowel > OE /j/ or [dʒ] and /k/ or [tʃ] vs OIc /g/ and /k/ (cp. above, 2.2.2.1)

(A) OE *hildecalla* ‘war-herald’: Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §291, and Hofmann 1957: 31) suggests that this compound, only attested in Ex 252, could be Norse-derived (cp. OIc *kalla* ‘to call, shout, cry’; cp. OE *ceallian* ‘to call’, see above, 2.2.2.1.A). However, as explained by Stanley (Stanley 1969: 94–95) and Dance (Dance 1999: 144–45), the determinatum of the compound is likely to represent instead a native term, especially given that Old Norse does not record an equivalent weak noun meaning ‘caller, herald’. Its form could be explained by referring either to the significant presence of Anglian terms in the Old English poetic vocabulary or to the fact that the second element in a compound is likely not to bear stress (cp. Irving 1959: 9).

(B) OE ‘sadolgarum’: see above, note 112 in Chapter 2.

<sup>3</sup> Fisher (F. Fischer 1909: 23) inverts the directions of borrowing and suggests that the Norse term has been borrowed from the Old English noun, which is also the etymon for OFr. *targe*.

### III.1.7. PGmc \*/sk-/ > OE [ʃ-] vs VAN /sk-/ (cp. above, 2.2.2.2)

(A) OE (*ge*)*scēot* ‘ready, quick’: This adjective has sometimes been tentatively associated with OIc *skjótr* ‘swift, quick’ (< PGmc \**skeutaz*; cp. ME *skēt(e)*, PDE *skeet*; see Björkman 1900–02: 126–27, and Hofmann 1955: §243). Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 127) presents the fact that we do not encounter Middle English forms with <sch-> or <sh-> as evidence of the Norse origin of the term. However, we do not know how the term would have been pronounced during the Old English period; it may be the case that, as suggested by Peters (Peters 1981: 115), the onset of ME *skēt(e)* was influenced by the Norse pronunciation of the term. Indeed, OE *scēot* represents the expected reflex of PGmc \**skeutaz* in Old English, and there are various factors which seem to argue in favour of its association with OE (*ge*)*scēotan* ‘to hurl missiles, run’ and *sc(e)ot* ‘shot, shooting, darting, rapid motion’ rather than its derivation from Viking Age Norse (cp. de Vries 1961: s.v. *skjótr*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *skeet*, adv. and a., and Orel 2003: s.v. \**skeutaz*):

(A.1) the word-field is widely attested in the Germanic languages (see Orel 2003: s.vv. \**sketanan*, \**skeutaz*, and \**skeutaz* ~ \**skeutan*; cf. above, 2.1);

(A.2) the term is only recorded in Æthelwold’s translation of the Benedictine Rule (BenR 58.97.16 = BenRWells 58.96.16), and the presence of a Norse-derived non-technical term in a tenth-century West Saxon text is indeed surprising, if nothing else (cf. above, 2.1). Furthermore, the Wells fragment of the Rule records the adjective with the native prefix *ge*-.

(B) OE *scipere* ‘shipman, sailor’: Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §§347 and 386) would like to associate this noun, recorded in ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.26 and 29, and ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.13, with the Viking Age Norse noun recorded in various runic inscriptions as **skibari**, nom. sing. (Sm. 42; Kinander 1935–61: 130–35) and **skibara**, acc. pl. (DR 379; Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 435–36; cp. OIc *skipari* ‘seaman’; see Jesch 2001b: 184–86).<sup>4</sup> However, as noted already by Peters (Peters 1981: 115), de Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *skipari*) suggests that the Norse term is in fact a loan-word from either OE *scipere* or from the term attested as MLG *schippere* (cp. PDE *skipper*; see the *OED* 1989: s.v. *skipper*, n.<sup>2</sup>).<sup>5</sup> It may also be the case that these terms are independent formations.

(C) OE *scot* ‘tribute’: Harmer suggests that OE *scot* in OE *scotfrēo* ‘free of tribute’ might have been influenced by the Viking Age Norse noun represented by

<sup>4</sup> On the by-name ‘scipri’ in the Domesday Book (ESS 22.16), see Tengvik 1938: 267.

<sup>5</sup> On other Low German loan-words in Old Norse, see F. Fischer 1909: 26–43.



Olc *skot* ‘appeal’ (Harmer 1989: 439). However, Björkman explains that, while ME *skot* ‘payment for provision of food or drink’ is likely to derive from the Norse term (but cp. the Norse-derived OFr. *escot*, *escote* ‘reckoning, payment’), the foreign origin of the Old English term is not certain because we do not know what its pronunciation was like (Björkman 1900–02: 130). We cannot take the lack of <e> after <sc> as a reliable indication of the fact that the term was not pronounced with [ʃ]. It is not clear whether the vowel should be interpreted as a diacritic or as part of a newly created diphthong through palatal diphthongization, but it is at least clear that its presence is by no means regular throughout the different dialects in Old English (see Hogg 1992: §§5.65–70). Given the existence of OE *sc(e)ot* (PDE *shot*), the unreliability of the lack of <e>, and the fact that the textual distribution of OE *scotfrēo* is not particularly suggestive of Norse origin,<sup>6</sup> it may be better to consider OE *scot* in this compound as native, although its Norse origin cannot be fully ruled out. If the latter were the case, the term would simply represent the influence of Norse pronunciation, and this would not have led to the restructuring of the lexico-semantic field.

(D) OE *scylīan*: Besides suggesting the Norse derivation of the phrase OE *scylīan of māle* ‘to discharge from service’ recorded in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1049 (see above, 2.2.1.7.A), Hoffmann (Hofmann 1955: §352) would also like to analyse the verb itself as being Norse-derived (cp. W. H. Stevenson 1887: 335, Björkman 1900–02: 127, Peters 1981: 95, and the OED 1989: s.v. *skill*, v.<sup>1</sup>). However, even though the phrase may find its model in Old Norse, it is not necessarily the case that the verb recorded in the C-text derives from the Viking Age Norse verb represented by Olc *skilja* because Old English texts record as well OE *āscylīan* (*āscilian*) ‘to separate, divide’ (and IOE *tōscylīan* ‘to separate, divide’; cp. ME *shillen*, PDE *shill*; see the MED: s.v. *shillen*, v.2, and the OED 1989: s.v. *shill*, v.<sup>2</sup>). Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 127) does not rule out the possibility that the Old and Middle English forms with /ʃ/ represent an Anglicization of the Norse verb; however, given the existence of OFris. *skilla* ‘to quarrel’ and MLG *schillen* ‘to differ’ and the fact that OE *āscylīan* is already recorded in the late tenth-century Cleopatra glossaries (e.g. ClGl 1 (Stryker) 2137 = ClGl 3 (Quinn) 2266 and ClGl 1 (Stryker) 2138 = ClGl 3 (Quinn) 1056), the fully native origin of the /ʃ/-forms is quite likely. Thus, there are two possibilities:

<sup>6</sup> It appears in Ch 1075 (Harm 15), Ch 1120 (Harm 76), Ch 1130 (Harm 86), Ch 1131 (Harm 87), Ch 1137 (Harm 93), and Ch 1148 (Harm 104); see above, II.15.1.9, II.15.2.20, II.15.2.27, II.15.2.32, II.15.2.38, and the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 1131.

(D.1) OE *scylian* / *scilian* is a Norse-derived loan-word;

(D.2) OE *scylian* / *scilian* is a native term, and the Middle English forms with /sk/ can be explained either as representing a reflex of the Viking Age Norse verb or as having been influenced by its pronunciation (cp. ME *skēt(e)*, see above, III.1.7.A). Accordingly, the phrase in the C-text could be described as a 'phrasal loan-blend', i.e. in the rendering of the Norse phrase the native verb has replaced the Norse cognate, while the noun represents a loan-word (cp. OE *beran ūp māl*; see above, 2.2.1.7.A).

Admittedly, the existence of a native cognate does not fully negate the possibility that the *Chronicle* verb represents instead the Viking Age Norse term; however, it seems to make Norse influence unnecessary.

(E) OE *wisc(h)ere* 'diviner?': Morris (W. Morris 1968: 121–23) would like to analyse this term, attested in *ÆHom* 30 6, as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *vizkr* 'clever'); however, the term is likely to be a deverbal noun formed on the basis of OE *wiscan* 'to wish', which had associations with wizardry and the pronouncing of curses (see Robinson 1965: 303–04; cp. Bammesberger 1979: 138–39).

### III.1.8. PGmc \*[ð] > OE /d/ vs OIc [-ð-] (/θ-/) (cp. above, 2.2.2.3)

(A) OE 'greðe': This term glosses L *sodalem* (cp. L *sodalis* 'fellow, intimate comrade') in OccGl 45.3 (Nap) 2, a gloss which is recorded amongst the Old English glosses to Bede's *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* in the mid-eleventh-century Peterborough manuscript Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 163 (see Ker 1990: no. 304); cp. 'gr.' as a gloss for L *sodalis* in OccGl 28 (Nap) 275, a gloss to Ælfric Bata's version of Ælfric's *Colloquium* in Oxford, St John's College, MS 154, a Durham manuscript from the first half of the eleventh century (see Ker 1990: no. 362). According to Meritt,

the association of Middle English *greipen* with the preparation of food, the association of *sodalis* with the serving of food and the companionship of the table, the fact that both *greðe* and *gr.* occur as glosses in contexts where the matter of food is important, the fact that both are late glosses — these points suggest that *greðe* is related to *greipen* and that it means 'one who prepares and partakes of food with another, a companion'. (Meritt 1954: 86–87)

If 'greðe' is associated with ME *greithen*, it should definitely be analysed as a Norse-derived loan-word because the presence of the dental fricative strongly suggests Norse origin (cp. OIc *greiða* 'to prepare, arrange' < PGmc *\*zaraidjan* < PIE *\*-rēidʰ*; cf. OE (*ge*)*rædan* 'to advise, arrange, equip'). Meritt's explana-

tion seems slightly far-fetched, though. One possible alternative is suggested by Morris (W. Morris 1968: 147). He notes that ME *grith* (OE *grið*), which can also be spelt <grethe>, is commonly attested with the meaning ‘friendship’ (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *grith*, sense 2.b). If this etymology is accepted, these should be counted amongst the occurrences of OE *grið*, on which see above, 2.5.I and I.39.2).

(B) OE ‘haeðen’: This term glosses L *mastruga* (cp. L *mastruca* ‘garment made of skins’) in ClGI (Stryker) 4201. Björkman would like to associate it with OIc *heðinn* ‘jacket of fur or skin’ (cf. OE *heden* ‘robe, hood, chasuble’) (Björkman 1900–02: 163). See, however, Pons-Sanz 2006a for an argument in favour of considering the spelling as a mistake for OE *heden*, probably by association with OE *hæðen* ‘heathen’.

(C) OE ‘hundrað’: This by-form (cf. OE *hundred* ‘hundred’) is mainly recorded in Aldred’s glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels and to the Durham Ritual (see above, II.223). The presence of <ð> and <a> could be considered to point towards the Norse origin of the term (cp. OIc *hundrað* ‘hundred’; cp. Björkman 1900–02: 163, K. Brunner 1965: §327, Ross 1982: 197, and Pons-Sanz 2004). However, the presence of the fricative could be explained as a result of the tendency in the glosses to use <ð> for <d> in unstressed syllables (this may also account for OE ‘hundreð’ in the glosses to the Rushworth Gospels; see above, II.168), while the presence of the unstressed vowel /a/ could be explained by referring to the confusion of unaccented vowels (cp. OE ‘hundreð’ in MtGI (Li) 13.23; cp. Hofmann 1955: §248, and Peters 1981: 112–13). The etymology of this term therefore has to remain uncertain (see Pons-Sanz 2000: 109–11, with references), but, given that the term can be explained by relying on fully native principles, the claim in favour of Norse derivation seems unnecessary.

(D) OE *tīdung* ‘events, tidings, news’: This noun is only recorded, as far as the *OEC* is concerned, in ChronF (Baker) 995.58. The late date of the F-text (see above, II.163.22), the fact that the common Old English term to refer to ‘news, tidings’ is OE *ārende* and the attestation of the term in Middle English texts with <th> and <-endi> have led some scholars to argue in favour of analysing this complex as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *tīðindi* ‘tidings, news, events’; see e.g. A. Campbell 1959: §566, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *tiding*, Dance 2003: 378, and Dance 2011: 103–04). The presence of <d> instead of <ð> or <þ> and <-ung> instead of the Norse suffix in the Middle English noun are attributed to the process of Anglicization of the term and its association with OE *tīd* ‘time’ (<PGmc \*tīði-; cf. OIc *tīð* ‘time’). However, as argued by Peters (Peters 1981: 119, with references), while the Middle English forms are likely to have been influ-

enced by the Norse term (cp. de Vries 1961: s.v. *tīðendi*), there is no reason why the Old English term itself could not be analysed as a native formation on the basis of OE *tīdan* ‘to betide, happen’ (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 166, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *tīdung*, the *MED*: s.v. *tīdinge*, Kluge 1995: s.v. *Zeitung*, and Kries 2003: 196). The term could thus be associated with MHG *zītunge* ‘message, announcement, news’, and MLG / MDu. *tīdinge* (Du. *tijding*) id.

(E) OE ‘yðlið’: see above, note 76 in Chapter 2.

**III.1.9. PGmc \*/-Vw-/, where V represents a short vowel, > OE /e:ow, i:ow, æ:aw/ vs OIc /-gg-/ (cp. PGmc \**zlawwaz* > OE *glēaw* ‘penetrating, keen, wise, skilful’ vs OIc *glōgg* ‘clear, clever’)**

The sound change summarized above, which is commonly known as Holtzmann’s law or sharpening, has traditionally been described as follows:

Intervocalic *j w* after short vowels show in many words strengthened articulation; we may represent the Germanic forms as *jj ww* [...]. In West Germanic, the first part of the lengthened semi-vowel forms a diphthong with the preceding short vowel, but in Gothic and Norse it is narrowed to a stop. (Prokosch 1939: 92)

In this respect, it would seem that it could be used as one of the phonological features which identify Norse-derived terms in Old English. However, this process is extremely problematic. On the one hand, various explanations have been brought forward to account for it (see Collinge 1985: 93–98). Smith (L. Smith 1997 and L. Smith 1999) has recently provided an explanation which combines many of the previously suggested triggers (viz. variable accent placement, laryngeals, and Verner’s Law) with preference laws for syllable structure. It is thus not clear whether it is the glides or the laryngeals that underwent strengthening. On the other hand, and much more importantly for our purposes, Bugge (Bugge 1888) established long ago that the effect of this process can also be observed in the West Germanic languages (e.g. OE *brycg* ‘bridge’, OFris. *brigge*, *bregge* id., OHG *brucca* id., cp. ON *bryggja* ‘landing-stage, quay’; cp. Prokosch 1939: 93, Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *bhrū-* / *bhrēu-*, L. Smith 1997: 6–7, 123, 146, and L. Smith 1999: 68–69 and 91–92). This casts some doubt on its use as an identifier of Norse derivation. Yet two words attested in the *OEC* have been attributed a Norse origin on the basis that they may exhibit sharpening.

(A) OE *raggig* ‘shaggy, bristly, rough’: This adjective is recorded as a gloss for L *setosa* ‘bristly’ in glosses to Aldhelm’s *Prosa de virginitate* (viz. AldV 12 (Nap) 30 = AldV 1 (Goossens) 5072 = AldV 13.1 (Nap) 5191). It is commonly

associated with OIc *rogg* 'long hair' (possibly < Proto-Norse \**rawwō*; see e.g. Serjeantson 1935: 71, and Peters 1981: 97). See, however, Pons-Sanz 2011: 42–44 for alternative (native) explanations for the origin of the term.

(B) OE *getryccað*: This verb renders L *confidete* (cp. L *confidere* 'to trust, confide') in JnGl (Li) 16.33. The presence of the geminated consonant and its dialectal distribution may point towards its Norse derivation (cp. OIc *tryggva* 'to make firm and trusty'; see Hofmann 1955: §243, and Peters 1981: 110–11); see, however, Pons-Sanz 2006d for an argument in favour of its native origin.

### III.1.10. Various Processes of Consonantal Assimilation in Old Norse

(A) OE *brōd* 'shoot, sprout': This term is only attested, as far as the *OEC* is concerned, in PsCaI (Lindelöf) 7(6).2, where it renders L *gramina* (cp. L *gramen* 'grass, plant, herb'). This gloss seems to have been written by a hand different from the main eleventh-century glossing hand (see Lindelöf 1909–14: II, 10), but probably contemporary with it (see Ker 1990: no. 280). The term could be associated with ME *brod* 'shoot, sprout', which is commonly analysed as a Norse-derived term (cp. OIc *broddr* 'spike, sting, prick, goad'; see Björkman 1900–02: 168, Lindelöf 1909–14: I, 320 s.v. *brod*, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *brod*, Serjeantson 1935: 83, the *MED*: s.v. *brod*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *broddr*, the *DOE*: s.v. *brod*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *brod*, n.<sup>1</sup>). The reason for this derivation is that the common Old English term is *brord* 'prick, point, blade', the expected reflex of PGmc \**bruzdaz*, while the term under consideration seems to show instead the process PGmc \*/zđ/ > \*/Rđ/ > /dd/ undergone by the Norse term (cp. Noreen 1923: §224.2). However, it may also be the case that <brod> is either a spelling mistake for <brord> (cp. Peters 1981: 103) or a representation of a native by-form which arose following the loss of the rhotacized consonant (cp. OE *mēd* vs *meord* 'reward'; see Hogg 1992: §4.16). If the latter is the case, the root vowel in this by-form may have undergone shortening by analogy with OE *brord*. A native derivation for the term under consideration would be more fitting to the text where it is recorded (see Lindelöf 1909–14: II, 56 on the language of the glosses to the hymns and canticles of Lambeth Psalter).

(B) OE *gullisc*: This adjective, which is attributed to silver, is only recorded in the prose dialogue between Solomon and Saturn recorded in the tenth-century manuscript Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 422 (viz. Sol II 68). Menner (Menner 1944: 111–12) and Peters (Peters 1981: 99) argue in favour of analysing it as a Norse-derived loan-blend (cp. OIc *gulligr* 'golden' and OE *-isc*; cp. Lendinara 1981: 110–14, and Anlezark 2009: 10–11). The

base of the derivative would be a reflex of the Viking Age Norse noun recorded in Sö. 179 as **kuli**, dat. sing. (Brate and Wessén 1924–36: 153–56; cp. OIc *gull* ‘gold’, which exhibits the North Germanic assimilation \*/lþ/ > /ll/; see Noreen 1913: §78 and Noreen 1923: §275; cf. OE *gold* ‘gold’ < PGmc \**gulþan*). This derivation would not be fully at odds with Menner’s dating of the Solomon and Saturn dialogue to the late ninth or early tenth century and his argument in favour of identifying the original composition as an Anglian text (Menner 1941: 12–21). The Norse origin of the term is, however, more difficult to maintain when the text is associated with the school developed around King Alfred’s court, as recently suggested by O’Neill (O’Neill 1997), or with the school around Abbot Dunstan of Glastonbury, as Anlezark (Anlezark 2009: 49–57) would have it. Thus, it may be the case that the basis of the term is actually native. Krogmann (Krogmann 1936: 371) suggests that it could be associated with OE *gealla* ‘gall’, OIc *gall* id., OS and OHG *galla* id. < PGmc \**zallan* / \**zallōn* < PIE \**ǵʰol-*. Accordingly, he hypothesizes an Old English ablaut by-form \**gull* or \**gulle* ‘brightness’ and suggests that the meaning of the adjective under consideration is ‘shiny, bright’. This association is not too far-fetched because the Proto-Indo-European root has been associated with PIE \**ǵʰel-* (cp. Skt *hári-* ‘pale, yellowish, greenish’, Av. *zairi-* ‘yellow, yellowish’, L *helvus* ‘light bay’; see Orel 2003: s.v. \**zallan*).

(C) OE *ridesohr* ‘fever’: This hapax legomenon, only attested in MkGl (Ru) 1.31, is associated by, amongst others, Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 161), Carr (Carr 1939: 31), and de Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *riða*) with OIc *riðusótt* ‘shivering fever’. Partially, this etymological explanation is based on the fact that the term may exhibit the Norse lowering of \*/u/ to \*/o/ before \*/x/, which disappeared before the literary period. \*/o/ was subsequently lengthened after the loss of /x/ as well as when standing in front of \*/xt/ > /tt/, which may be the case here (see Noreen 1913: §46.c, and Noreen 1923: §112.2). See, however, Pons-Sanz 2007a for an argument in favour of the compound’s native origin.

### III.1.11. Other Phonological Differences

(A) OE *cāl* ‘kale’: Björkman suggests that OE *cāl*, which renders L *arboracia* (cp. L *armoracia* ‘kale, charlock’) and *lapsana* ‘edible plant, charlock’ in AntGl 4 (Kindschi) 164, could be understood as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *kál* ‘cabbage, kale’, cf. OE *cāw(e)l* ‘kale, cabbage’ < L *caulis* ‘stem, stock, cabbage’; Björkman 1900–02: 106; cp. de Vries 1961: s.v. *kál*, and the OED 1989: s.v. *cole*, n.<sup>1</sup>). While later northern forms with /a:/ may indeed partially repre-



sent the Norse term, the dialectal distribution of the term in Old English does not render this possibility any more likely than a fully native evolution of the Latin loan-word. Hogg (Hogg 1992: §5.14) explains that, when the diphthong \*/au/ is followed by a word-final liquid in Old English, the liquid tends to be syllabified (and possibly velarized) while /u/ tends to be lost. Alternatively, /u/ may be retained by analogy with inflected forms. This provides a clear explanation for the existence of the two by-forms in Old English (cp. Holthausen 1934: s.vv. *cāl* and *cāul*, the *MED*: s.v. *cōl*, n.1, the *DOE*: s.v. *cāwel*, and the *VEPN*: s.v. *cāl*).

(B) OE 'gesthus': Goolden (Goolden 1958: xxix) and Brunner (K. Brunner 1965: §91 Anm. 2) would like to associate this term, commonly attested in Ælfrician and non-Ælfrician compositions, with OIc *gestahús* 'guest-room' (cf. WS *giesthūs* 'guest-house'). However, the presence of <e> as opposed to WS <y, ie> can be explained as a result of the inconsistency of palatal diphthongization in Old English dialects (cp. above, 2.3.1.1.A), and, indeed, the *OED* (*OED* 1989: s.v. *guest*, n.) associates the Ælfrician forms with the common Anglian forms.

(C) OE *ðe(o)nest* 'service': This form is only recorded in ChronD (Cubbin) 1054.11 and in a Peterborough Interpolation, viz. ChronE (Irvine) 656.87, where it is part of the compound 'þeonestmen' (cf. OE *ðegn* 'servant, minister'). Bosworth and Toller (Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *þegnest*) suggest that this term may show either German (cp. OHG *dionōst* 'service' and MLG *dēn(e)st* id.; cp. Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *þēnest*) or Norse (cp. OIc *þjónusta* 'service') influence. Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §369) would like to argue in favour of the latter (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 223, and Szogs 1931: 120), despite the fact that he rejects Luick's (Luick 1964: §384.3) and Ross's suggestion (Ross 1939–40: 6–7) that <eo> in the E-text is a representation of the Norse diphthong. Hofmann attributes the spelling instead to false etymologizing, with <eo> instead of <e> (cp. <seo> in ChronE (Irvine) 656.83 for OE *sē*, the nom. sing. of the masc. demonstrative pronoun, and <heorotogas> in ChronE (Irvine) 656.73, which represents OE *heretoga* 'commander, chieftain'). Yet the Old English noun under consideration could easily be associated with WS *ðēn*, where, as explained by Hogg (Hogg 1992: §7.71), /j/ has been lost in front of the dental nasal and the root vowel has undergone lengthening (cp. <þenestran> for OE *ðegnestra* 'female servant' in AldV 1 (Goossens) 1388 = AldV 13.1 (Nap) 1358; cp. Peters 1981: 122). The noun can therefore be analysed as being fully native (cp. de Vries 1961: s.v. *þjónasta*, *þjónusta*, and Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.v. *thiania*).

(D) OE 'þur(r)esdæg' ('Thursday'): Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 180–81) presents the different paths followed by PGmc \*/n/ standing before



\*/r/ in Old English and Old Norse (OE /nr/ vs OIc /r/; see Noreen 1913: §85.7) as another trait which can be used to identify Norse loan-words in English. From this perspective, Ælfric's *þōr* (ÆLS (Martin) 714, and ÆHom 22 124 and 142; cp. WHom 12 56 and 74, and HomU 34 (Nap 42) 149) is a clear attempt to represent the Scandinavian name of the deity called *Dunor* (< PGmc \**punraz*) in Old English (cp. OIc *Þórr*; on the lowering of \*/u/ to /o:/ in Old Norse, see above, 2.2.1.6). This attempt is fully in keeping with the context of the term, where Ælfric discusses the names of the Scandinavian deities. On this basis, Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 180) argues that the Old English forms where /n/ has been lost in the name of the day of the week (e.g. 'þurresdæg' in HomU 6 (ScraggVerc 15) 113) should also be attributed to Norse influence. However, the loss of /n/ in this context can be associated with other cases in which the consonant drops in contact with /r/ in native terms: e.g. 'mire' for *mīnre* (in S 1494 (Whitelock 14) 8, 10, 11, etc.) or 'sæteresdæg' for *Sæternesday* (in HomS 21 (BIHom 6) 107, and ÆHomM 2 (Irv 3) 273 and 278; see A. Campbell 1959: §474, and Ekwall 1935–36: 55–56; cp. Hogg 1992: §7.85).<sup>7</sup>

## III.2. Morphological Evidence

### III.2.1. Nominal Morphology

#### (A) Genitive compounds:<sup>8</sup>

(A.1) OE *hēafdesmann* 'leader, captain': The common Old English term expressing the meaning 'leader, captain' was *hēafodmann*, while the genitive compound is only recorded once in the *OEC*, viz. ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.77. This, together with the fact that the compound refers to the leaders of two hundred ships arriving from Denmark, is commonly taken as an indication that the term has been influenced by the Norse equivalent (cp. OIc *hofuðsmaðr* 'head-

<sup>7</sup> From this perspective, 'ður' in ClGI 1 (Stryker) 3317 and 'þures' in ClGI 1 (Stryker) 3734 and ProgI 4 (Först) 5 do not need to represent the Scandinavian name of the god (*pace* Björkman 1917: 315, and Townend 2002: 140), but may simply record a by-form of the Old English name otherwise attested in the name of the weekday. Admittedly, the loss of /n/ in the possessive pronoun and OE *Sæternesday* should be associated with low-stress positions, whereas its loss in OE *Dunresdæg* should be associated with stressed positions. However, Hogg presents other cases of loss of the nasal in consonantal groups in stressed position: e.g. OE *elnboga* 'elbow' > *elboga* (Hogg 1992: §7.85).

<sup>8</sup> On the genitive compounds OE *oxangang*, *plögesland*, *manslot*, see above, 2.4.2.O, and below, III.3.1.D.

man, chief'; cp. Björkman 1900–02: 12, Carr 1939: 29, Hofmann 1955: §391, Peters 1981: 95, Kniezsa 1994: 239, and Townend 2002: 203). However, the Norse origin of the term is not always accepted (see the *MED*: s.v. *hēdes-man*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *headsman*).

(A.2) OE *landesman* 'inhabitant of a country, native': Given that the term is attested in texts which exhibit what seem to be bona fide Norse-derived terms (viz. LawIIAtr 7, LawDuns 1, and ChronE (Irvine) 1046.17 and 1068.2–3),<sup>9</sup> and that the older term to refer to the local inhabitants in Old English texts was OE *landlēod*, Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §346) suggests that this compound may have been Norse-derived (cp. OIc *landsmaðr* 'inhabitant, native of a country'; cp. Peters 1981: 91, and Kniezsa 1994: 238). However, we should note that the phrasal structure OE *landes mann* is commonly attested in the Ælfrician compositions. Therefore, Hofmann's analysis does not seem to carry too much weight, and, indeed, his view is not generally accepted (see, for instance, Carr 1939: 76, who suggests that the Norse and English terms, as well as OHG *landman* and MLG *lantman*, may be independent loan-renditions of L *patriota* 'fellow countryman', the *MED*: s.v. *lōndes-man*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *landsman*, n.<sup>1</sup>).

(A.3) OE *rædesmann* 'councillor, advisor, steward?': Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §339), following Steenstrup (Steenstrup 1882: 126) and Kluge (Kluge 1901: 934), suggests that this compound may be Norse-derived (cp. OIc *ræðis-maðr* 'steward, manager') because it is only recorded in late Old English texts (viz. ChronE (Irvine) 1039.7–8, Ch 1465 (Rob 86) 29, and Ch 1467 (Rob 91) 8) and in one context in particular, viz. Ch 1467 (Rob 91) 8, it may mean 'steward' rather than the expected 'advisor, counsellor' (cp. OE *ræd* 'advice, counsel'; cp. Carr 1939: 29, Robertson 1939: 175 and 423, Peters 1981: 91, and Kniezsa 1994: 238).<sup>10</sup> Even if that were the case, the same does not necessarily apply to the other contexts, and, indeed, other than its formal similarity with the Norse term and its late attestation, nothing in particular suggests its foreign origin. At the most, we could suggest that the context referred to exhibits a case of semantic loan. Yet it is also worth considering that the meaning 'steward, manager' may be a native development in association with the sense 'to rule, govern, direct' of the verb belonging to this word-family, viz. OE *rædan*. Thus, the *MED* (s.v. *rēdes-man*), and the *OED* (*OED* 1989: s.v. *redesman*) do not acknowledge any type of Norse influence on the compound (cp. OFris. *rēdesmon* 'adviser').

<sup>9</sup> The non-genitive compound is not very common either; it is attested in LawDuns 6 and 6.1, and Ex 179.

<sup>10</sup> OE 'rædemen' is attested in PPs (prose) 32.15, but it means 'horsemen'.

(A.4) OE *stēoresmann* 'skipper, master of a ship': While this genitive compound is only recorded in LawIIAtr 4, OE *stēormann* 'steersman, pilot' is attested in other contexts (e.g. BrGl 1 (Wright-Wülker) 2.2, where it renders L *gubernator navis* 'steersman, pilot', and ÆCHom II 43 325.226). This may indicate that the genitive compound has been modelled on the Norse equivalent (cp. OIc *stýrismaðr*, and ODa. *stýrasman* and *stýrisman* 'skipper, captain'; cp. Hofmann 1955: 256, Peters 1981: 88, and Townend 2002: 203). Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §256) suggests that not only the form of the genitive compound but also the meaning has been influenced by the Norse term; he therefore also attributes the meaning 'to command a ship' for OE *stēoran* in ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.16 and 19 to Norse influence (Hofmann 1955: §345; cp. VAN **stura**, inf., in U 654; Wessén and B. F. Jansson 1940–58: III, 112–17; cp. OIc *stýra*, about which Jesch 2001b: 174 and 181 explains that it seems to have involved commanding the ship as well as the more limited action of guiding the tiller). Dance, while admitting the likely Norse origin of the compound, reminds us that 'entirely native Old English equivalents (notably *scip(es) hlāford*) are rare, and it therefore remains difficult to tell the possible developments in this sense area *before* Scandinavian influence was felt' (Dance 2003: 436).<sup>11</sup> Peters (Peters 1981: 117) goes further and denies that OE *stēoran* in the aforementioned sense has been influenced by the Norse cognate because the native verb has attested meanings which would not have made the semantic development significant enough for foreign influence to be necessary (Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *stīeran* provides the following meanings for the verb: 'to steer, guide, direct, govern, rule').<sup>12</sup> If semantic influence is rejected,<sup>13</sup> only the

<sup>11</sup> On this semantic field in Old English, see the TOE: 05.12.01.09.03.

<sup>12</sup> It may be the case that the meaning 'to command a ship' for the verb had already developed by the tenth century. The *Life of St Andrew* in the Blickling Homilies records OE *stēorrēdra* on three occasions as a reference to Christ in disguise who is in control of a boat together with two angels (LS 1.2 (AndrewMor) 68, 88, and 123). Bosworth and Toller assign it the meanings 'skipper, steersman, captain' (Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *stēor-rēdra*); similarly, Clark Hall renders it as 'steersman, master of a ship' (Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *stēorrēdra*) and TOE (05.12.01.09.03) translates it, together with OE *stēormann*, as 'captain and steersman'. And 244 simply refers to Christ and his angels collectively as 'lidweardas' ('sailors, guardians of a ship'), not making the meaning of OE *stēorrēdra* any clearer. The existence of the verb OE *stīeran* could also be taken as evidence, albeit by no means definitive, in favour of the native origin of the by-name 'stirman', recorded in the Domesday Book, instead of its Norse derivation (see Tengvik 1938: 271–72).

<sup>13</sup> Cp. L *gubernator*, which is attested in British sources meaning 'steersman', 'ship's master', and 'naval commander, admiral' (see the DMLBS: s.v. *gubernator*).

possible influence of the morphological form of the compound remains. This evidence is not considered to be strong enough by the *MED* (s.v. *stēresman*) and the *OED* (*OED* 1989: s.v. *steersman*), where the term is given as a native compound.

When dealing with these genitive or secondary compounds we should bear two factors in mind:

- (1) it is not always easy to differentiate between a compound and a phrase, an issue which is particularly important, for instance, in the case of OE *landesmann* (see above, III.2.1.A.2);
- (2) as noted by Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §346) himself, this type of compositional pattern is by no means unknown in Old English (cp. OE *cynnesmann* ‘kinsman’, *ælmesmann* ‘almsman’, *tūnesmann* ‘townsman’; see Bergsten 1911: 114–17, Carr 1939: 316–18, Marchand 1969: 66–67, Kastovsky 1992: 369–70, and Kastovsky 2006: 232, cp. Sauer 1992: 159). Its increase in productivity during the late Old English and early Middle English periods may be associated with the fact that we can already see in Old English traces of word-based derivation (see Kastovsky 1990, and Sauer 1992: 152–63). More importantly, the data collected by Sauer (Sauer 1992: 157–58) suggests that the transition between non-genitive compounds and a genitive structure, be it a compound or a phrase, was not a difficult one (cp. Bergsten 1911: 115–17). This may explain the alternation between the two types which we have in our corpus; therefore, no foreign influence needs to be called upon in this respect. This would leave a series of features which do not carry much weight (e.g. late attestation of the term, possible semantic influence, attestation of other Norse-derived terms in the same texts) as the only evidence we can rely on to claim the Norse derivation of these terms. They have therefore been excluded from the main body of this study.

**(B)** OE *ðuuencgu*: This is the form with which Aldred renders L *philacteria* (cp. L *phylacteria* ‘phylactery’) in MtGl (Li) 23.5. The presence of <e> in the root instead of the expected <a> or <o> (cp. OE *ðwang* ‘thong, band, strap’ < PGmc *\*þwanzaz*) has sometimes been taken as an indication that the term has been influenced by the Norse cognate because we would not expect to see the effects of *i*-umlaut in this term (cp. OIc *þvengr* ‘thong, latchet’ < PGmc *\*þwanziz*; see Holthausen 1934: s.v. *ðweng*, Serjeantson 1935: 65, the *MED*: s.v. *thong*, Britton 1957: §314, Peters 1981: 98, Pons-Sanz 2000: 114 and Pons-Sanz 2004). However, Farman has *þwænga* in the equivalent con-

text of the Rushworth Gospels, viz. MtGl (Ru) 23.5, which suggests that in Anglian there was a by-form of *ðwang* derived from the same Germanic variant as the Norse term (cp. the *OED* 1989: s.v. *thong*, n.; on <æ> as a representation of *i*-umlauted PGmc \*/a/ + nasal, see Scargill 1940: 10–11, cp. G. Britton 1957: §§7 and 198.2 for <e> as a spelling for the same sound in the glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels; see also Hogg 1992: §5.78).<sup>14</sup> Even though Farman's glosses are very close to Aldred's in the latter part of the gospel according to St Matthew, it seems that the work of the two glossators only overlaps from MkGl (Ru) 26.1 onwards (see Ross 1979a, Kotake 2012 and above, II.168). Aldred's and Farman's terms should therefore be taken as independent examples of the Anglian by-form (cp. Ross 1979b: 197).

### III.2.2. Other Morphosyntactic Features

(A) OE 'æt' and 'æd': These forms are recorded in the Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels in a context where the conjunction *þæt* may have been expected instead (MtGl (Li) 24.48, MkGl (Li) 6.55, etc.). It may be the case that, as suggested by de Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *at*) and the *DOE* (s.v. *æd*, *æt*), this term goes back to the Viking Age Norse conjunction represented by OIc *at* 'that, so that' (cp. Jordan 1974: §204). Yet, the possibility that these forms developed as reduced by-forms of the Old English conjunction *ðæt* cannot be ruled out (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 201, the *MED*: s.vv. *that*, conj. and *that*, particle, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *at*, 'at', rel. pron., adv., conj., and Kries 2003: 96). The dialectal distribution of the text could argue in favour of the Norse derivation of the conjunction (cp. below, III.3.2.A), but the early date of the Aldredian glosses (see above, II.223) could be presented as an argument against the borrowing of a Norse grammatical term.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> On the dialectal features of Farman's glosses, see Hogg 2006b: 402–05, with references.

<sup>15</sup> However, Norse-derived grammatical influence has been claimed for the use of the prefix *ge-* in the glosses, which is associated with the Viking Age Norse prepositions represented by OIc *af* and *um* (see Samuels 1949–50). See also below, IV.2.3.2.G.

### III.3. Close Association with the Scandinavian Newcomers and Settlers

#### III.3.1. Reference to the Scandinavian Newcomers and their World

(A) OE *æsc* ‘ash-tree; type of ship’ word-field: The simplex appears various times in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* referring to the ships of the Scandinavian marauders (see e.g. ChronA (Bately) 896.19 and 20 = ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 897.16 and 18 = ChronD (Cubbin) 897.18 and 19), while the compounds OE *æscmann* ‘shipman, sailor, pirate’ and *æschere* ‘naval force’ are applied to them for instance in ChronA (Bately) 917.51 and Mald 69, respectively. This has led some scholars to suggest that OE *æsc* in these contexts is a Norse-derived loan-translation or a semantic loan (cp. OIc *askr* ‘ash-tree, small ship’; see Hofmann 1955: §224, Peters 1981: 88 and 89, and Townend 2002: 203). See, however, Pons-Sanz (Pons-Sanz 2008: 430–31) and Thier (Thier 2009: 156–57).

(B) Members of the OE *frīð* word-field: OE *unfrīð* meaning ‘lack of peace agreement, safeguard’ is recorded in Ohthere’s account of his travels (viz. Or 1 1.14.19) and in a couple of legal texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas (LawIIAtr 6 and LawNorthu 56). This textual distribution may suggest that the term is a Norse-derived loan-translation (cp. OIc *úfríðr* ‘state of war; lack of truce, peace’; see Townend 2002: 96). However, Fell has shown that OE *frīð* could also be used to define ‘the actual safeguard or protection’ under which one journeyed, ‘rather than the vague and general idea of going in peace’ (Fell 1982–85: 93; cp. the DOE: s.v. *frīð* sense 4.a.iii). In this respect, this term, like OE *unfrīðland* ‘area outside the truce’, only recorded in LawIIAtr 3.1 (cp. OIc *frīðland* ‘friendly country, place of retreat’), need not be derived from Old Norse (cp. Fell 1982–85: 97). Similarly, there is no reason, other than the mere existence of the equivalent Norse compound, to analyse OE *frīðland* ‘land at peace’ (i.e. land with which one is on friendly terms), recorded in ChronE (Irvine) 1097.28, as a Norse-derived loan-translation, as suggested by Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 240) and Carr (Carr 1939: 28), following Kluge (Kluge 1901: 933) (cp. the DOE: s.v. *frīðland*).

(C) OE *healffrēo* ‘half-free’: This term is recorded twice in the *OEC*: in Ch 1529 (Whitelock 36) 3 (‘þo men, halffre þeowe 7 lisingar’), where it could act as an adjective, according to Pelteret (Pelteret 1995: 290–91), and this would suggest the following translation: ‘the men: the half-free slaves and the *lisingar*’; and in an addition (‘[hwilum be freotmen] hwilum be healffreon’) in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 113 to HomU 29.2 (Nap 35) 27, a text which is commonly attributed to Wulfstan II of York (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: ch. 1).



Pelteret (Pelteret 1991: 185–86, and Pelteret 1995: 46 and 290–92) suggests that the term is used in these texts in an attempt to render one of the two categories of freedmen in (Anglo)Scandinavian society (cp. OIc *frjálsgrjafi*, a freedman whose right to dispose of property was lower than that of the *leysingar*, while his obligations towards his manumitor were higher; see Pelteret 1991: 185, and Pelteret 1995: 290–91; see above, 2.4.1.F). The term could therefore be interpreted as a Norse-derived loan-translation. Pelteret bases his argument on two issues:

(C.1) the two attestations could be associated with the Danelaw: Ch 1529 (Whitelock 36) is a text originating from East Anglia (see above, II.154), while the Hatton manuscript *may* derive from an exemplar written in York, where the term could have been added;

(C.2) HomU 29.2 (Nap 35) 27 is the only case in which OE *healf* + an adjective (cp. OE *fréo* ‘free’) is used as a noun, and this, together with the fact that the term is declined as a weak noun, could be taken as an indication of the late date of the formation.

These arguments are, however, problematic. On the one hand, the connection of the homiletic text with Scandinavianized areas seems quite tenuous, as Pelteret (Pelteret 1995: 292) admits (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 194–98 on the production of manuscripts recording Wulfstan’s works at York). On the other hand, we need to remember that OE *fréo* was nominalized fairly frequently (see e.g. Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *fréo*), and, accordingly, the same process could have taken place in a compound with the adjective as the second element. Furthermore, <healfreon> does not necessarily suggest a weak noun. ‘-freon’ could be interpreted as a late Old English by-form of *fréom*, the preposition OE *be* being commonly followed by a noun in the dative (cp. ‘to freon’ (‘as free’) in Ch 1283 (Rob 16) 22); thus, ‘-men’ in the HomU 29.2 (Nap 35) context is likely to represent the dat. sing. of OE *mann* ‘person; man’ (cp. the DOE: s.vv. *be*, *big*, and *fréo*, adj.).

Pelteret’s attempt to see Scandinavian cultural influence on this term also seems slightly forced. Even though it is not up to a linguist to discuss freedom in Anglo-Saxon England, it seems that the difference in status between a slave and a free man was not always clear and that, even in Anglo-Saxon England, there existed different degrees within the social group of the manumitted. Pelteret (Pelteret 1991: 126–27) himself mentions the example of Wulflæd in Wynflæd’s will (Whitelock 1930: no. 3): she would be freed only if she served both Wynflæd’s daughter and grand-daughter. Pelteret (Pelteret 1995: 127) points out that “freedom” in this context could only mean that Wulflæd was able to negotiate her terms of service, and perhaps she also gained additional status at law’.



(D) OE *oxangang* ‘an eighth of a plough-land or hide’ (< OE *ōxa* ‘ox’ + OE *gang* ‘passage, course, progress’): This compound is sometimes associated with a Norse term said to be represented by OIc *oxagang* / *oxnagang* (see, for instance, Peters 1981: 96, Kisbye 1982a: 65, Hart 1992: 317, and Kastovsky 1992: 324). However, the term is not recorded by Fritzner (Fritzner 1972), Zöega (Zöega 1910) or Cleasby and Vigfusson (Cleasby and Vigfusson 1957), nor does it appear in the word-list of the *ONP*, available online.<sup>16</sup> Stenton (Stenton 1927: 40 n. 1) explains the fact that Danish sources record *otting* instead of *\*oxgang* as follows: ‘it is probable [...] that the Danes of the ninth century were familiar with both forms of expression, but that the term *oxgang* disappeared in Denmark when the original system based on the *ból* fell into decay, but persisted in England, where its meaning was always understood’.<sup>17</sup> The debate on the Norse derivation of the term is closely associated with the discussion on the Scandinavian origin of the ploughland and *oxgang* system of land division, a discussion which does not seem to be settled. While Lennard (Lennard 1944) argues in favour of its Scandinavian origin (cp. Hart 1992: 309–19), which would support a Norse derivation for the term under consideration (cp. OE *plōgesland*; see above, 2.4.2.O.2), Charles-Edwards (Charles-Edwards 1972: 14–15) argues in favour of considering the terms simply as new names for an old system, which weakens the case in favour of a foreign origin for the term. Given the uncertainty surrounding the term and the lack of clear evidence in favour of its Norse derivation, it seems better to agree with the *MED* (s.v. *ox-gange*) and the *OED* (*OED* 1989: s.v. *oxgang*) on the likely native origin of the compound.

(E) OE *wicing* ‘pirate, viking’: The common use of this term in Old English sources to refer to the Scandinavian marauders has sometimes been analysed as Norse-derived (cp. VAN *uikikar*, nom. pl., in DR 216, and *uikika*, gen. pl., in U 617; see Jacobsen and Moltke 1941–42: 261–64, and Wessén and B. F. Jansson 1940–58: III, 28–39; cp. OIc *vikingr* ‘freebooter, sea-rover, pirate, viking’; see A. Campbell 1959: §566, de Vries 1961: s.v. *vikingr*, and Kniezsa 1994: 241).<sup>18</sup> See, however, Pons-Sanz (Pons-Sanz 2008: 429–30) and Heide (Heide 2008).

(F) Terms in the speech of a Viking messenger (Mald 29–41): Various terms and expressions employed by the Viking messenger presented in the Old

<sup>16</sup> See <[http://www.onp.hum.ku.dk/wordlist\\_d.html](http://www.onp.hum.ku.dk/wordlist_d.html)> [accessed 16 May 2006].

<sup>17</sup> On the Danish *otting*, see Fladby 1956 and Hafström 1962.

<sup>18</sup> OE *wicing* should be distinguished from PDE *viking*, which was reintroduced into English in the early nineteenth century (see Fell 1987). On OIc *viking*, see further Jesch 2002, Heide 2005, and Heide 2006.

English poem known as *The Battle of Maldon* have been attributed a Norse origin and have been interpreted as possible representations of ‘the first literary use of dialect in English’ (Robinson 1993: 123), because they may have been specifically chosen by the *Maldon*-poet to represent the Viking as a foreigner: OE *gārræs* ‘storm of spears’ (Mald 32; cp. OIc *geirrás* ‘spear-torrent, rush of spears’), OE *þon* ‘(than)’ (Mald 33; cp. OIc *þan* ‘than’), OE *dælan hilde* ‘to engage in battle, share out battle’ (Mald 33; cp. OIc *deila heiptir* ‘to deal with feuds’ and *deila sakar* ‘to deal with lawsuits’) and OE *syllan ... on hyra sylfra dōm* ‘to give according to (one’s) judgement’ (Mald 38; cp. OIc *selja sjálfðæmi* ‘to give (someone) right to judge in one’s own terms’). The use of OE *snell* ‘quick, active; ready, bold, determined’ in Mald 29 has also been attributed to the poet’s familiarity with the Viking Age Norse adjective represented by OIc *snjallr* ‘valiant, doughty’. See, however, Pons-Sanz (Pons-Sanz 2008: 437).

### III.3.2. Dialectal Distribution

(A) OE *afulic* ‘perverse’: This adjective, which glosses L *perversus* ‘perverse, evil’ in LiEpis11, the only context where it is attested as far as the *OEC* is concerned, has sometimes been analysed as an English new formation on the basis of the Norse-derived root *\*afu(h)* (cp. OIc *ofugr* ‘unkind, harsh; turned the wrong way’; see Ross 1982: 197). However, the only reason to do so seems to be the fact that the root is only attested in this Northumbrian text because cognates of this adjective are well-attested in other West Germanic languages (cp. OS *abuh*, *avuh* ‘perverse, evil’, OHG *abuh*, *abah* id.; cf. above, 2.1). As pointed out by Kries (Kries 2003: 146), the Aldredian term could be native or Norse-derived (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 20); thus, not all authorities accept the Norse-derivation of the term under discussion (or that of PDE *awk*; see Holthausen 1934: s.v. *afulic*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *awk*, a. (adv., n.), the *DOE*: s.v. *afulic*, and Heidermanns 1993: 94 s.v. *abuha*; cp. Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *apo-*, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *ofugr*). The existence of the West Germanic cognates and the fact that the members of the word-field are not attested again until the fourteenth century are taken here as an indication that the term under consideration may be a native Northumbrian form, while later attestations of the term, which are, in the main, associated with the Scandinavianized areas, may exhibit a combination of native and foreign influence (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *auke*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. s.v. *awk*, a. (adv., n.); cp. Nb. *til* vs ME *til*, see below, IV.2.3.2.G).

(B) OE *almus*: This term is the determinatum in a compound meaning ‘sacrificial victim’ with OE *cwic* ‘alive’ as the determinant, attested in MkGl (Li)

9.49. Britton (G. Britton 1957: §314) and Hill (B. Hill 1989: 149) have suggested that it should be interpreted as a Norse-derived term (cp. OIc *almusa*, *qlmusa* ‘alms, charity’), which would associate it with PDE *almous*, the northern equivalent of PDE *alms* (see the *EDD*: s.v. *almous*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *almous*, and Kries 2003: 314). Even though neither scholar specifies any reasons for the aforementioned analysis, we can assume that they rely on the dialectal distribution of the term and the presence of <u> in the second syllable instead of the expected <y> or <e> (cp. OE *almes*(*se*), *almys*(*se*) ‘alms’), because /a/ instead of /æ/ for this word-field is not uncommon in the Old Northumbrian texts. This interpretation, however, has to account for the fact that the Old Norse term seems to be itself a loan-word from the continental West Germanic languages (see F. Fischer 1909: 66, Thors 1957: 595, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *qlmusa*, *almusa*; cp. Björkman 1900–02: 226). This, in itself, does not prevent the term under consideration from being a loan-word (cp. OE *taperæx*; see above, 2.5.S). However, it should be associated with the fact that there is much inconsistency in the handling of unstressed vowels in the Lindisfarne glosses (cp. Ross 1937: 35–53, G. Britton 1957: §§89–115, and above, III.1.8.C). It therefore seems more appropriate to interpret the term simply as a spelling variant of the Old English noun, as suggested by the *DOE* (s.vv. *almesse*, *almes*, and *cwic-almes*) and by Owun’s gloss in MkGl (Ru) 9.49, viz. ‘cwicu almes’.

(C) OE *ambeht* / *ambiht* / *embeht* / *embiht* ‘servant, disciple’: The glosses to the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels record variants of OE *ambiht* and other members of its word-field with <a-> instead of the expected <o->, and with the otherwise unattested <e->. This led Ross (Ross 1940: 39–41) to suggest that these forms have been influenced by the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *ambótt*, *ambátt* ‘bondwoman, concubine’, and *embætti* ‘service’ (on which see Thors 1957: 245). This suggestion has, however, been rejected by Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §250–51; cp. Peters 1981: 100–01, and Pons-Sanz 2000: 105–07). Ross must have taken Hofmann’s arguments on board, because he no longer included these terms in the list of Norse-derived words in the Lindisfarne glosses presented in his 1982 article.

(D) OE *bȳ* ‘dwelling’: This noun is only attested as far as the *OEC* is concerned in MkGl (Li) 5.3, where ‘lytelo by’ renders L *domicilium* ‘dwelling’. It has sometimes been identified as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *býr* / ODa. *bý* ‘settlement, village, farmstead’; see Serjeantson 1935: 66, the *DOE*: s.v. *bū*, Peters 1981: 104–05, Ross 1982: 197, Pons-Sanz 2000: 90–91, and Pons-Sanz 2004). The attestation of the Norse-derived place-formative element *-bȳ*, especially in Yorkshire and the East Midlands (see Svensson 1997: 58–60, 165 and 171, and *VEPN*: s.v. *bȳ*), may suggest that the Aldredian term

represents an early and uncommon attestation of the loan-word: not only is it recorded independently, but it also has a different meaning from that of the suggested Norse etymon. Thus, given that the Northumbrian texts attest forms of OE *bȳa* as by-forms of OE *būan* 'to inhabit, dwell' (see the *DOE*: s.v. *būan*; cp. the *DOE*: s.v. *bȳing*, and Kastovsky 1985: 242) and that other terms belonging to the same word-field also have <y> (cp. OE *byht* and *gebyhð* 'dwelling, abode'), it is likely that the Aldredian term is a Northumbrian native by-form of OE *bū* 'dwelling', only attested in PPs 101.25 (but cp. OE *gebūnes* 'dwelling'; cp. Björkman 1900–02: 286 n. 1, and Hofmann 1955: §247; see also *VEPN*: s.v. *bȳ*, and Abrams and Parsons 2004: 399). I have argued previously (Pons-Sanz 2000: 90–91) that Nb. *bȳa* may have developed because of the influence of the Norse term; however, it now seems to me that the possibilities that the by-forms with *i*-umlaut derived as a result of the fact that the verb was identified as a weak Class I verb (see K. Brunner 1965: §417, Anm. 9) or that the native verb could have had a weak Class III by-form (see Flasdieck 1935: §36 A 23.a.5, and the *DOE*: s.v. *būan*; cp. A. Campbell 1959: §763) are equally (if not more) valid explanations.

(E) OE *copp* 'cup, beaker; sponge': The fact that this noun is only attested, as far as the *OEC* is concerned, in the Aldredian glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels (and, not surprisingly, in Owun's glosses to the Rushworth Gospels; see the *DOE*: s.v. *copp*) has led some scholars to suggest that its form rather than being a reflex of ML *coppa*, a variant of L *cuppa* (> OE *cuppe* 'cup'), may have been influenced by that of the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *koppr* 'cup, small vessel' (see Ross 1982: 197, and Wollmann 1990: 350). However, the attestation of <o>-forms in other Germanic languages (cp. OHG *chopf* 'beaker, bowl', and MDu. *cop(p)* 'drinking cup'; cf. above, 2.1) and the fact that the Norse term seems to be a loan-word from Middle Dutch (see F. Fischer 1909: 60; cp. de Vries 1961: s.v. *koppr*) can be taken as arguments against the Norse-derivation of the form (cp. the *OED* 1989: s.v. *cop*, n.<sup>1</sup>).

(F) OE *fēorðing* 'quarter of a penny': This monetary term is only recorded in late Northumbrian texts as far as the *OEC* is concerned (see the *DOE*: s.v. *fēorðing*). This, together with the fact that a term meaning 'third part' (viz. OE *\*þriding* 'one of the three administrative districts into which Yorkshire was formerly divided') is commonly analysed as Norse-derived (see above, note 2 in Chapter 1), has led to occasional suggestions that the term under consideration may be a Norse-derived loan-translation (cp. OIc *fjórðungr* 'the fourth part, quarter'; see G. Britton 1957: §314, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *farthing*, and Pons-Sanz 2000: 101–02; cp. the *MED*: s.v. *ferthing*). However, given that the suffix *-ing* appears in other names of coins (OE *scilling* 'shilling', and *pening* / *pen(d)ing*

‘coin, money’) as well as in other terms referring to fractional parts (OE *tēoðung* / *tīðing* ‘division into ten, tenth part, tithe’), there does not seem to be any need to bring Norse influence into the discussion of its etymology (cp. OHG *fiordung* / OFris. *fiardunge* ‘fourth part’, and OE *fēorðling* ‘fourth part’; see Matzerath 1912: 14–15).

(G) OE *forwost* / *forwest* ‘chief person, one first in rank or most eminent; leadership’: This noun is only recorded in the glosses to the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels (see the *DOE*: s.v. *for-wost*). This dialectal distribution led Ross (Ross 1982: 197) to suggest that this is a Norse-derived term (cp. OIc *forusta* ‘leadership’, *forvist(a)* ‘management’). This suggestion is slightly surprising, given that he had previously concluded that

we have no reason to assume that the Northumbrian word is in any sense of the word a Norse loan-word; for the Icelandic word usually means ‘leadership’ but the Northumbrian one usually ‘leader’, and, even more important, there is no trace in Northumbrian of the weak inflexion so characteristic of the Icelandic word. (Ross 1933: 149)

In the 1933 article he argued that *-wost* is likely to represent OE *wist* ‘being, existence’, an abstract noun related to OE *wesan* ‘to be’ (see Holthausen 1934: s.v. *wist* 1); <o> and <e> would have developed by analogy with OE *wesan* and Nb. *wosan* (see e.g. MtGl (Li) 19.21). Thus, the term would originally have meant ‘leadership’, and the meaning ‘leader’ would have developed following the semantic change *nomen actionis* > *nomen agentis*. Jordan (Jordan 1906: 39) would also associate the second component with OE *wesan*, but would attribute its ending to an analogical formation with the superlative form of OE *forma* ‘first’ (viz. *firmest*; cp. Meritt 1941: 77–78). Pokorny (Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *prō-uo-*) hypothesizes that the term may be related to PIE *prō-uo-*, with which OE *frēa* ‘lord’ (< PGmc *\*frawōn*) should also be associated. In any case, as suggested by Ross himself, there is no reason to argue in favour of a foreign rather than a native origin for the term (cp. Holthausen 1934: s.v. *forwost*, and the *DOE*: s.v. *for-wost*).

(H) OE ‘groef-’: This by-form of OE *gerēfa* ‘reeve’, attested in the glosses to the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels, was analysed as being Norse-derived by Ross (Ross 1940: 45–47) on the grounds that <g-> for the Old English prefix *ge-* is not a common spelling in the (Lindisfarne) glosses, while syncope of the vowel is common in Old Norse (cp. OIc *greifi* ‘reeve’; see Noreen 1913: §50.a, and Noreen 1923: §154).<sup>19</sup> However, the suggestion of Norse derivation

<sup>19</sup> The same explanation could be applied to the by-name OE ‘greua’ in Rec 24.4 (Stevenson) 2 (cp. Tengvik 1938: 252–53, who suggests that the term may exhibit the Old East Norse

for this term was refuted by Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §252; cp. Peters 1981: 111–12, and Pons-Sanz 2000: 108–09) on the basis that, as pointed out by Björkman, the Norse term may have been borrowed from OS *grêve* ‘count, director, inspector’ (Björkman 1900–02: 43; cp. F. Fischer 1909: 30, and Hofmann 1955: §78; cp. de Vries 1961: s.v. *greifi*, who does not discount the possibility that the term may have been borrowed from Old English). The weakening of the prefix should therefore be assigned to native causes (on the prefix in the Lindisfarne glosses, see further Samuels 1949 and Samuels 1949–50). As with his analysis of OE *ambeht* / *embiht* (see above, III.3.2.C), Ross must have acknowledged this explanation because this term is also missing from the list which he provided in 1982.

(I) OE *mac(c)alic* ‘convenient’: As far as the *OEC* is concerned, this adjective is only recorded in MkGl (Li) 6.21 = MkGl (Ru) 6.21, where it glosses L *oportunus* ‘fit, meet, convenient, suitable’. This dialectal distribution and the typically northern usage of the reflexes of PDE *mackly* ‘evenly, aptly, easily’ (see the *EDD*: s.v. *make*, s.b<sup>1</sup>, and Kries 2003: 178) have led to the analysis of this adjective as a likely Norse-derived term (cp. Olc *makligr* ‘meet, proper, becoming’; see Lea 1894: §1.5, Carr 1939: 30, and Ross 1982: 197; cp. Pons-Sanz 2000: 103–04, and Pons-Sanz 2004). However, given the existence of similar terms in other West Germanic languages (cp. OHG *gimablih* ‘adequate, suitable; comfortable’, MDu. *gemackelijc* ‘calm, comfortable’; cf. above, 2.1), as well as OE *gemac* ‘well-suited, companionable, similar, equal’, *gemacca* / *gemacca* ‘mate, companion; husband, wife’, and *gemæclīc* ‘conjugal’, this analysis is not beyond doubt (see Björkman 1900–02: 250, Jordan 1906: 70, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *maca-līc*, the *MED*: s.v. *mak*, G. Britton 1957: II.s.v. *mac(c)alic*, and the *OED* 2000–: s.vv. *mack*, a., and *mackly*). Indeed, Ross (Ross 1982: 197) has noted that the glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels record other terms without the prefix *ge-* as opposed to forms with it elsewhere (cp. Samuels 1949). If we consider this along with the fact that the Aldredian glosses to the Durham Ritual seem to record ‘*maca*’ as a variant of *gemacca* / *gemacca* (HyGl 1 (Thompson-Lind) 10.4; see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *maca*), we seem to get closer to a native derivation for the adjective, although, admittedly, the possibility that this is a Norse-derived term cannot be fully discounted.

(J) OE *ōc* ‘and, but’: see above, 2.5.P.



(K) OE 'screpes': This verb renders L *arescit* (cp. L *arescere* 'to become dry') in MkGl (Ru) 9.18.<sup>20</sup> Bosworth and Toller associate Owun's verb with OIc *skrjúpr* 'weak, frail' (Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *scrípan*), according to which Ross (Ross 1982: 198) hypothesizes that it could be Norse-derived. De Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *skrjúpr*) associates the Old Icelandic adjective with OIc *skropinn*, a participial form of OIc *skreppa* 'to slip, slip away, absent oneself' which replaced the original *skorpinn* (see Noreen 1923: §490 Anm. 4). OIc *skorpa* was formed on the basis of the participial form *skorpinn*. De Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *skorpa*), while following Thorson's suggestion that PDE *scorped* 'dried up, parched, as the skin in fever' (Thorson 1936: 43) should be interpreted as a loan-word based on the Norse verb (cp. OIc *skarpr* 'shrivelled'; cp. Björkman 1900–02: 130), presents OE *screpan* (*sic*; *scrēpan* in Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *scrēpan*) 'to wither' as a cognate rather than a loan; he draws the reader's attention to MLG and MDu. *schrepel* 'thin, meager' (cp. Verwijs and others 1885–1952: s.v. *schrepel*, and Jordan 1906: 71). This would associate the verb with OE *scrimman* 'to shrink', a nasalized by-form of the same root (see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. ((*s*)*kerb*(*h*)-, (*s*)*kerb*(*h*)-, Mann 1984–87: s.v. *skremb*-(2), and Rix and others 2001: s.v. (*s*)*kerb*-).

(L) OE 'scripen(ende)': L *austerus* 'harsh, severe' is rendered as 'scripen' in LkGl (Li) 19.21, and 'scripende' in LkGl (Ru) 19.22. Holthausen (Holthausen 1934: s.v. *scripende*) would like to associate the latter with MnNw. *skripen* 'shy; friendly, wanting to be petted', and Ross (Ross 1982: 197) gives the same association for the Aldredian term. However, as suggested by Meritt (Meritt 1954: 55–56; cp. W. Morris 1968: 168), it is more likely that 'scripende' is a metathesized by-form of OE *scirpende* (cp. OE *scierpan* 'to sharpen, invigorate, strengthen'). Meritt would like to interpret the Aldredian term, viz. OE 'scripen', as an independent word, related to OE *scearp* 'sharp, pointed, severe, harsh' and *scierpan*, but Bammesberger, while accepting Meritt's suggestion regarding OE 'scripende', prefers to see Aldred's term as a 'defective spelling' of OE *scirpende* (Bammesberger 1979: 113). In any case, there is no need to interpret these terms as Norse-derived.

(M) OE *sunset*: This compound is only recorded in the *OEC* in the glosses to the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels, where it renders L *occasu* (cp. L *occasus* 'a setting of heavenly bodies, especially the sun'; LkGl (Li) 12.54 = LkGl (Ru) 12.54) and L *occidentem* (cp. L *occidens* 'the setting sun, hence the west'; MtGl (Li) 24.27). The *OED* (*OED* 1989: s.vv. *set*, n.<sup>1</sup>, and *sunset*, n.) suggests

<sup>20</sup> Lindelöf interprets OE 'screpes' as representing either a spelling mistake or a misunderstanding on Owun's behalf (Lindelöf 1901: §16 Anm. 1).



that it may have been formed under the influence of the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *sólarsetr* 'sunset' because OE *set* meant mainly 'seat, habitation', not 'the act of setting' (cp. Pons-Sanz 2000: 104–05). This may indeed be the case; however, another term meaning 'seat, sitting place, residence', viz. OE *setl*, is also used to express the same concept as OE *sunset* (e.g. 'ær sunna eft on setl ga' in PeriD 24.15.23–24; cp. OE *setlgang* 'setting (of the sun)' as a common gloss for L *occassus*). Thus, Aldred's term does not have to be explained by relying on Norse influence (cp. Skeat 1893).

(N) OE 'tre(-)': The glosses to the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels record many non-diphthongal by-forms of OE *trēo* 'tree' (< PGmc *\*trewan*): e.g. 'tre' and 'tree', nom. sing. (MtGl (Li) 18 and LkGl (Li) 6.43), '-tre', acc. sing. (LkGl (Li) 6.22), 'trees', gen. sing. (LkHeadGl (Li) 55, 67), 'tree', dat. sing. (MkGl (Li) 12.26 = MkGl (Ru) 12.26), etc. We would expect to find diphthongal forms in the nominative and accusative singular following the vocalization of PGmc *\*/w/* in final position (see A. Campbell 1959: §120.3, and Hogg 1992: §3.19.2), while in other forms where the approximant was retained the diphthong would typically develop because of back umlaut (see A. Campbell 1959: §146, and Hogg 1992: §5.22). Thus, the aforementioned non-diphthongal forms have commonly been analysed as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *tré* 'tree'; see Ross 1940: 47–52, Hofmann 1955: §253, G. Britton 1957: §119 n. 1, Pons-Sanz 2000: 112–14, and Pons-Sanz 2004). However, a native explanation for these forms based on analogy can be put forward (cp. Luick 1964: §243.c, A. Campbell 1959: §584.1.b, K. Brunner 1965: §129 Anm. 2, and Peters 1981: 119–20). PGmc *\*/w/* is commonly lost in Old English before *\*/i/* and */u/* (see A. Campbell 1959: §§405–06, and Hogg 1992: §§4.7–8); thus, we could expect *\*tre-um* < *\*trewum* as a form for the dat. pl., and *\*tre-i* < *\*trewi* as a form for the dat. sing. (or a corresponding case; see A. Campbell 1959: §571, cp. Bammesberger 1990: §3.2.3.7). New forms with the stem *tre-* could therefore develop, as suggested by the following forms in the Vespasian Psalter: '-tres', gen. sing. (PsCaA 1 (Kuhn) 6.31), and 'trea', gen. pl. (PsGlA (Kuhn) 73.5). Ross (Ross 1939–40) bases part of his argument in favour of Norse derivation on the fact that <ee> seems to suggest an original disyllabic pronunciation, which he would account for by relying on VAN *\*treve*, a dat. sing. form. Yet the existence of the expected disyllabic by-forms of the term in the glosses (cp. 'trewum' in MkGl (Li) 11.8) could easily explain the association of the forms under discussion with disyllabism. Alternatively, <ee> could simply be interpreted as a spelling variant of <e> for /e:/ (cp. the common spelling <gaast> for OE *gāst* 'breath, spirit, angel' in the Aldredian glosses; see Ross 1937: 157, and G. Britton 1957: §§185.2 and 204.2).

(O) OE 'turfgret' ('turfpit', as translated by Whitelock 1930: 87): Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 200 n. to l. 19) would like to interpret this compound, only recorded as far as Old English is concerned in Ch 1516 (Whitelock 33) 8 (the will of a certain Edwin, who had possessions mainly in Norfolk; see Whitelock 1930: 199 n. to l. 12), as a Norse-derived term (cp. OIc *torfgrof* 'peat-hole'; cp. 'torfgret' in London, British Library, MS Add. 14,847, fol. 15b). There is, however, no reason not to associate the determinatum of the compound with OE *grafan* 'to dig, engrave' (cp. OE *graf* 'cave, grave, trench', and *græft* 'graven image, carved object'; cp. ME *turfgraving* 'turf-cutting, digging'). The presence of <t> instead of the expected <f> could be explained as a result of the fact that the late thirteenth-century scribe working on Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 may have associated the compound with ME *turfgrafte* 'legal right to cut turf or peat; a place where turf is dug, turbarry', the determinatum of which is a by-form of ME *graffe* 'a graft, cutting' < OF *grafe* / *greffe* 'graft, cutting'; see the *MED*: s.vv. *turf-grafte* and *grafte*).<sup>21</sup> The compound could therefore be interpreted as a native formation, in keeping with other compounds with OE *turf* 'turf' as the determinant (e.g. OE *turfhaga* 'grassy plot', or *turfhlēow* 'covering of turf').

(P) OE 'þeora': Evans (Evans 2000) has recently argued that the genitive plural form OE 'þeora', recorded in ChronE (Irvine) 449.4 and 1086.125, should be analysed as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *þeir(r)a*, the genitive form of the 3<sup>rd</sup> person pl. personal pronoun). Evans explains that the forms cannot be understood as scribal errors for OE *heora* because confusion of <h> and <þ> is not common, and it is otherwise unattested in the work of the first Peterborough scribe. He also denies the possibility that 'þeora' represents a conflation of the forms of the Old English personal pronoun *heora* / *hira* and the demonstrative *ðāra* / *ðāra* (cp. OE 'hiera' in ChronA (Bately) 449.2 and 'heora' in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 449.2 vs 'þan' for OE *ðām* / *ðæm* in ChronF (Baker) 448.4) because it appears in the phrase 'on þeora dagum' in ChronE (Irvine) 449.4, and the demonstrative is not otherwise recorded in the *OEC* in a similar context. However, Evans's etymological explanation involves many problems, as noted by Evans himself (Evans 2000: 105–06) and by Morse-Gagné (Morse-Gagné 2003: 235–36):

(P.1) the fact that the text records first a form of the genitive instead of the nominative, while other texts, such as the *Ormulum*, show that the nominative was the first form in the paradigm to be adopted (see Morse-Gagné 2003: chs 3 and 4; see also above, III.1.1.A);

<sup>21</sup> On other misinterpretations by the scribe, see Lowe 2008: 101–03.

(P.2) the fact that there are no other examples of this form either in other annals copied by the scribe or in the annals of the Final Continuation, where Norse-derived terms are more common (see below, Appendix IV).

It may therefore be better to interpret these forms as representing OE *ðāra* / *ðæra*. <eo> instead of the expected <æ>, <a>, or <e> (see Irvine 2004: cxlv) could be explained as a result of either analogical levelling within the paradigms of the demonstrative pronouns (cp. 'þeoses' for OE *ðisses* in ChronE (Irvine) 1100.49 and 'þeosan' for OE *ðissum* in ChronE (Irvine) 1100.35);<sup>22</sup> or the confusion of <æ>, <ea>, <e>, <a>, and <eo> representing short and long sounds in the annals written by the first scribe (cp. 'heofdon' for OE *hæfdon* 'had' in ChronE (Irvine) 449.8, and 'seo' for OE *sæ* 'sea' in ChronE (Irvine) 1013.32; see Irvine 2004: cviii–cxxiv).

The use of the demonstrative pronoun where we might have expected the personal pronoun could be explained, as far as the 449-annal is concerned, as a result of the association of the names it refers to, Martianus and Valentinus, with their position as Roman emperors (cp. 'on þara casera dagum' ('in those emperors' days') in ÆLS (Cecilia) 4, 'on ðara yldrena casere timan' ('in the times of the older emperors') in LS 34 (SevenSleepers) 564, and 'on þara casere dagum Antonius ond Marcus' ('in the days of the emperors Antonius and Marcus') in Mart 5 (Kotzor) Ja 6, C.2). As far as the 1086-annal is concerned, the presence of the demonstrative on its own ('þa godan men niman æfter þeora godnesse' ('good men may take after their goodness')) can be associated with other Old English contexts where the demonstrative is used independently so as to avoid repetition of a preceding noun (see Mitchell 1985: §316).

(Q) OE *wītword*: This compound is only attested as far as Old English is concerned in LawIIIATR 3 ('And landcop & hlafordes gifu, þe he on riht age to gifanne, & lahcop & witword & gewitnes, þæt þæt stande, þæt hit nan man ne awende' ('and the purchase of land, and the lord's gift which he has the right to give, and *lahcōp* [see above, 2.2.1.2.B], and *wītword* and witness, are to be valid, so that no one may pervert them'); = LawNorthu 67.1) and Ch IWm (Farrer 89) 7. The late attestation of the term and the fact that the texts where it is recorded, both during the Old and Middle English periods (see the *MED*: s.v. *wit-word*), are associated with the Anglo-Scandinavianized areas (see above, II.13.1.5 and II.17.1.11) have led to frequent associations of the term with Norse influence (cp. OSwed. *vitu orþ* 'the assertion of a right by a party to whom the way to such assertion is legally open', as translated by Vinogradoff

<sup>22</sup> On the demonstrative forms of the first scribe, see further Millar 1997b.

1906–07: 537, and OIc *vitord* ‘knowledge’; see Vinogradoff 1908: 9, Hofmann 1955: §259, Stenton 1971: 512, and Neff 1989: 292–93). On this basis, it is suggested that the Old English term had a meaning similar to that recorded in Old Swedish (see *SGL*, XIII: 715–17, and Neff 1989: 292). Bosworth and Toller would translate it instead as ‘a statement which bears witness to anything’ (Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *wit-word*). However, Neff (Neff 1989: 292) argues that the presence of OE *gewitnes* ‘knowledge, testimony; a witness’ in the Æthelredian code would make this term redundant. Whitelock (Whitelock 1979: 440 n. 6) suggests that one of the possible translations for the term in this context is ‘agreement, contract’, one of the meanings of ME *witword* (cp. Liebermann 1903–16: I, 385, translation of LawNorthu 67.1); this interpretation would not make its placement next to OE *gewitnes* redundant. This meaning should be associated with the fact that the Latin version of Ch IWm (Farrer 89) renders OE *witword* as ‘testatio morientum’ (‘a document bearing witness to those dying, i.e. testament’) (see Bates 1998: no. 31). Thus, given that ‘testament’ is the likely meaning in one of its occurrences, and that the meaning ‘agreement, contract’ is not only well attested in Middle English texts, but also fits the Æthelredian context (and hence the context in the *Law of the Northumbrian Priests*), there is no need to associate this term with the Norse words (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *wit-word*, Peters 1981: 123, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *witword*).

OE *witword* can be said to have been formed by OE *wita* ‘a wise man; one who has knowledge, a witness’ (cp. OFris. *wita* ‘witness’, and *wita* / *weta* ‘to know, can, hear, declare under oath, judge’) + OE *word* ‘word’.<sup>23</sup> We could hypothesize that it developed as a loan-rendition of L *testamentum* ‘the declaration of one’s last will; hence, will, testament’ (< L *testari* ‘to be a witness’ (< L *testis* ‘witness’) + *men* + *tum*; see Leumann 1977: §326.2, and D. G. Miller 2006: 78–79 and 83). Other Old English terms which are used to render L *testamentum* are also associated with the idea of uttering or saying, e.g. OE *cwide* ‘utterance, saying, word; testament, will; agreement’ and *gecȳðednes* ‘testimony, testament’ (cp. OE *gecȳðan* ‘to proclaim, utter’). Given that L *testamentum* was also attributed the meaning ‘covenant, agreement’ as a result of a misunderstanding arising from the translation of the Bible (see Souter 1949: s.v. *testamentum*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *testament*, sense II, and Carson and others 2003: s.v. *testament* (*in the Bible*)), the term under consideration would also

<sup>23</sup> On the common loss of the composition vowel in Old English compounds with a weak noun as the determinant, see Carr 1939: 292.

have acquired the additional meaning (cp. OE *cwide* and OE *cȳðnes* ‘testimony; covenant’). The two meanings could easily have been associated by an Anglo-Saxon mind by means of the general sense ‘something that can be supported by the word of a witness’.

### III.4. Other Sources of Evidence

(A) OE *afol* ‘power, might’: This term, recorded in the works of Archbishop Wulfstan II of York, has sometimes been analysed as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *afl* ‘physical strength’; see, for instance, Björkman 1900–02: 201). See, however, Pons-Sanz (Pons-Sanz 2005b).

(B) OE *āgan* ‘to own’: Klæber (Klæber 1941: 32) would like to see the use of ‘ahte’ in Mald 189 (‘he gehleop þone coh þe ahte his hlaforð’ (‘he leapt on the horse that his lord had owned’)) as being influenced by that of its Norse cognate represented by OIc *atti* ‘possessed’. See, however, Pons-Sanz (Pons-Sanz 2008: 432).

(C) OE *ānлага*: This term is only recorded in ClGI 3 (Quinn) 536, where it glosses L *solitare* (cp. L *solitarius* ‘alone, lonely, solitary’). It has been identified with OIc *einlagi* ‘acting alone’ (see Holthausen 1934: s.vv. *ān-laga* and *лага* 1, Carr 1939: 27, and the DOE: s.v. *ān-laga*). There is, however, no reason to doubt the possibility that the term is a native compound formed by OE *ān* ‘one’ + *-лага*, a noun associated with OE *licgan* ‘to lie’ and *-læg*. The only reason to suggest that this is a Norse-derived compound is the presence of *-лага*, which immediately reminds one of OE *ūtlaga*. However, as suggested above, 2.4.1.E, right from the beginning the latter seems to have been associated with OE *lagu* ‘law’ rather than with any reference to ‘lying’. Carr (Carr 1939: 64–65) shows that compounds with a numeral as the determinant are common in all Germanic languages, and many independent equivalent compounds can be traced in the various Germanic languages: e.g. in the same context that ClGI 3 (Quinn) has *ānлага*, AldV 13 (Goossens) 1201 has ‘ænlipe’ (cp. OE *ānliepe* ‘single, separate, solitary, individual’), an adjective which has its Norse equivalent in the term represented by OIc *einbleypr* ‘single, unmarried’ (cp. OS *ēnlōpi* ‘single’; see Carr 1939: 62).

(D) OE ‘bælc’: Hofmann (Hofmann 1957: 19–20) would like to associate this noun, which seems to refer to some sort of overhead protection, possibly a cloud, in Ex 73 with OIc *bálkr* ‘balk, partition’. However, there are two alternatives to Hofmann’s analysis of the term as a Norse-derived noun. On the one hand, it may be the case that, as suggested by Holthausen (Holthausen 1951:

16), the noun should be emended to 'bælge / belge', the Anglian by-form of West Saxon *bylg* 'bellows' (cp. Irving 1959: 10). On the other hand, the Old English term may indeed be associated with OIc *bálkr*, but rather as a cognate. Lucas (Lucas 1994: 88 n. to l. 73) derives OE *bælc* from PGmc *\*balkuz* 'partition' (cp. OE *balca* < PGmc *\*balukōn* 'beam') and explains that this noun, while a *u*-stem noun originally, became assimilated with the *a*-stem nouns. <æ> in the root could then be explained as a result of the fact that final /lk/ after a front vowel would have had a palatal quality (see A. Campbell 1959: §428, n. 2), while breaking or restoration of /a/ only takes place before dark or velarized /l/. Tolkien (Tolkien 1981: 42 n. to l. 73) also presents a suggestion along these lines and hypothesizes a mutated derivative of PGmc *\*balk-*, without entering into further detail, although he does not reject the possibility that the term that is actually represented here is OE *bælc* 'swelling, pride, arrogance'; according to this suggestion, the cloud would have been described as a swelling mass. In a nutshell, this term is clearly very problematic, but there is no strong evidence in favour of its Norse-derivation, whatever its etymology might actually be (cp. DOE: s.v. *bælc'*, *bælcu*).

(E) OE *biddan* 'to ask, pray, beg' + accusative + infinitive: Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §355) would like to analyse the use of OE *biddan* in the structures 'bæd ealle þa þægnas syllan his wife ða landes' ('asked all the thanes to give his wife the lands...') in Ch 1462 (Rob 78) 30, and 'bæd hine faran into Cent' ('ordered him to go into Kent') in ChronE (Irvine) 1048.34 = ChronF (Baker) 1050.22–23 as Norse-derived on the basis that OE *biddan* does not normally collocate with a pronoun / noun in accusative and an infinitive, but with a subordinate clause (cf. OIc *biðja* 'to ask, beg, pray; to order', which does commonly collocate with an accusative noun / pronoun and an infinitive). This is the same basis on which Laborde (Laborde 1936: 82) would like to identify Norse influence on Mald 170. See, however, Pons-Sanz (Pons-Sanz 2008: 429).

(F) OE *gebōnod* 'ornamented': This past participle is recorded seven times in a list of books given by Bishop Leofric (Rec 10.1 (RobApp I 1) 22, 23, 24, 30, 31) and once in the will of Wulfgyth (Ch 1535 (Whitelock 32) 22).<sup>24</sup> Dance (Dance 2003: 190 n. 6) would like to associate it with ME *ibōned* < Norse-

<sup>24</sup> The latter attestation is recorded in the thirteenth-century codices Canterbury, Dean and Chapter Library, Register A and E. It could be included in Appendix IV because, as identified by Lowe (Lowe 1993: 10–15), the scribe of the version on which these codices rely (named X by Lowe) made significant alterations to the language of his copy, including the replacement of obsolete words with more modern equivalents (see also Laing 1993: 48–49). However, Lowe (Lowe 1993: 15) concludes about X's practices that 'any deviation from his models appear to



derived ME *ibōn* 'ready, prepared' (cp. OEN *bóin* 'ready, prepared', and OIc *búinn* 'ready'; see Björkman 1900–02: 206, and Björkman 1901: 5, with references, Förster 1933a: 21 n. 45, the *MED*: s.vv. *bōun* and *ibōn*, adj. and past part., and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *bound*, ppl. a.<sup>1</sup>) + the participial suffix. It seems, however, to be related to OE *bōn* 'ornament, figurehead on a ship', attested in ChronD (Cubbin) 1063.13. The root in these two terms could be derived from PIE *b<sup>b</sup>ā-* (cp. OIr. *bán* 'white' and MHG *buenen* 'to polish, scour'; see Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. *bhā-*, *bhō-*, *bhə-*, where the Old English verb is translated as 'to polish', Vendryes and others 1974–: s.v. *bán*, and Kluge 1995: s.v. *bohneren*). Accordingly, these terms can be analysed as native rather than Norse-derived (cp. the *DOE*: s.vv. *bōn* and *gebōnod*).

(G) OE *bōtlēas* 'unpardonable, not to be atoned for by *bōt*': This derivative, first recorded in LawIIIATR 1, has only found intermittent treatment in the surveys of Norse-derived vocabulary attested in English texts. Steenstrup (Steenstrup 1882: 257), followed by Carr (Carr 1939: 27; cp. Björkman 1900–02: 12), believes that it is a loan-translation with the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *bótlauss* 'without redress or compensation' as its model. It is ignored by Serjeantson (Serjeantson 1935) and Hofmann (Hofmann 1955), and hence by Peters (Peters 1981) and Wollmann (Wollmann 1996). It is not mentioned either by Neff (Neff 1989) in her study of the Norse-derived vocabulary in *III Æthelred*. Renewed claims in favour of its Norse origin come from Kisbye (Kisbye 1982a: 54 and 60). Given that OE *bōtwyrdē*, its antonym, is attested earlier than OE *bōtlēas* itself (LawIIIEg 2.2) and that the use of OE *bōt* 'compensation for an injury' seems to have been an old Anglo-Saxon practice (see Rubin 1996), there is little need to interpret the derivative under consideration as Norse-derived (cp. Åqvist 1968: 238–40).

(H) OE *bregdan hine sēcne* 'to pretend to be sick': This structure, recorded in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1003.10 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1003.10 = ChronE (Irvine) 1003.8, is considered to be Norse-derived by Olszewska (Olszewska 1933: 76 and 81; cp. OIc *bregða sér sjúkum* 'to pretend to be sick'). However, as noted by Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §303), the same structure, with a feminine rather than a masculine pronoun, can be found in *ÆLS* (Eugenia) 151, which argues in favour of its native derivation (cp. the *DOE*: s.v. *ge-bregdan*, sense 3.b).

stem from misunderstandings of the Old English, and not from a deliberate attempt to modernize the form of the original'.



(I) OE *cann* ‘exculpation, clearance (by oath, witness, or recognizance)’: Holthausen (Holthausen 1934: s.v. *cann*) and Serjeantson (Serjeantson 1935: 66) suggest that this noun, which is only attested in LawHl 16.3 and LawWi 17 and 21.1, should be analysed as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *kanna* ‘right to demand, claim something’). Serjeantson argues that, despite their age, the texts are actually only recorded in a twelfth-century manuscript, viz. the so-called *Textus Roffensis* (see Ker 1990: no. 373, and Wormald 1999: 244–53), which makes the attestation of a Norse-derived term possible. Even though this may indeed be the case, it is more likely that the noun should be associated with OE *gecennan* ‘to bring forth; to clear oneself, make a declaration in court’ (cp. the *DOE*: s.v. *cann*).

(J) OE *cweðan gēa wið* ‘to say yes in reply to (sth. or sb.)’: The structure, only attested in ChronD (Cubbin) 1067.23–24, is commonly identified as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *kveða já wið* ‘to say yes in reply’; cp. Björkman 1900–02: 109, Olszewska 1933: 82, and Hofmann 1955: §386; on the form of the adverb, see above, III.1.3.B). However, OE *cweðan gēa* is otherwise attested in the *OEC* (e.g. LS 7 (Euphr) 67), while OE *wið* can also be used adverbially (see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *wiþ*, sense VII) and the meaning of *wið* in this context (viz. ‘in reply to’) is otherwise attested for the preposition (see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *wiþ*, sense II.4.f). Furthermore, although ChronD (Cubbin) 1067 is, generally speaking, part of the set of annals here referred to as ChronNor2 (see above, II.163.17), the expression under discussion appears in what seems to be an interpolation, possibly from Worcester and possibly attributable to Archbishop Wulfstan II of Worcester (see above, note 14 in Appendix II).

(K) OE *cyrtel*: Fell (Fell 1984a: 62) argues that OE *cyrtel* in Or 1 1.15.19, referring to a piece of garment made of fur (in this case bearskin), has a meaning which is more appropriate to the Norse cognate (cp. OIc *kyrtel* ‘kirtle, tunic, short top garment worn by men’) than to the Old English term, because the latter is commonly used to refer to a full-length woman’s dress (cp. Townend 2002: 96). The term is recorded with the same meaning outside the Old English Orosius, according to which the analysis of the term is not only restricted to the communicative situation surrounding Ohthere’s account (cp. Treharne 1997: 163, and Dance 2003: 347; see above, 1.1). However, Owen-Crocker (Owen-Crocker 2004: 151, 183, 217) suggests that, while the semantic change ‘short garment’ > ‘long gown’ for women’s clothes may have taken place in the seventh or eighth century, there is no reason to believe that the same applied for the male garment. Thus, she explains that OE *cyrtel* was most likely used as a synonym of OE *tunece* ‘man’s tunic, woman’s gown of dark colour’ (Owen-Crocker 2004: 337) when referring to a man’s girdled tunic, usually cut short

enough to reveal the knee (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *kirtel*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *kirtle*, n.<sup>1</sup>, and Bately 2006: 44).

(L) OE *dænede*: The phrase *'feld dænede | secga swate'* (Brun 12b–13a) has caused much ink to be spilled because of the uncertain reading of the verb and the nominal phrase which follows it. Despite this uncertainty, Harris argues in favour of identifying skaldic influence on the *Brunanburh*-poet's lexical selection, because Norse texts record various contexts where OIc *dynja* 'to resound, pour' is associated with blood (Harris 1986; cp. Niles 1987: 361–62, and Bjork 2001: 393). If this were the case, we could identify this context as an example of a poetic loan-translation, which would grant its inclusion in the present study. These half-lines have been analysed in great detail by Carroll (Carroll 2001: 55–60), and the following lines rely on her study and review of the pertinent literature. The reading *'secga swate'* ('with the blood of the warriors'), attested in the B-, C-, and D-texts of the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, is likely to be the original wording, as opposed to *'secgas hwate'* ('bold warriors') in the A- and G-texts, which is metrically irregular. The verb remains much more problematic. It could indeed be identified as OE *dynnan* / *dynian* 'to resound', which may associate the wording of the poem with the skaldic contexts, but not necessarily so (cp. *'vox sanguinis fratris tui clamat ad me de terra'* ('the voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground') in Gen 4.10; see Berkhout 1974).<sup>25</sup> Yet, it could also be identified as OE *\*deanian* 'to steam, reek', OE *ðānian* 'to be or become moist, moisten', or OE *dunnian* 'to become dark' (see A. Campbell 1938: 98–102). Accordingly, Carroll concludes that it 'is so problematic a reading as to trouble the most optimistic of critics' (Carroll 2001: 60).

(M) OE *darian* 'to lie still or hidden': This verb is only recorded as far as the *OEC* is concerned in the so-called *Legend of the Seven Sleepers*, a text which was probably originally composed in the late tenth or the early eleventh century but which only survives in two independent early eleventh-century copies (London, British Library, MSS Cotton Julius E.vii and Otho B.x; see Ker 1990: nos 162 and 177, and Magennis 1994: 9–10). Magennis (Magennis 1994: 13–19), who sees its language as typically late West Saxon, suggests that the text is likely to be a product of the Benedictine Reform, although it cannot be directly associated with the Æthelwoldian school. OE *darian* is commonly regarded as native (and, therefore, is not treated in works dealing with the Norse-derived terms recorded in Old English texts), although its ultimate etymology remains unclear (see, for instance, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *dare*, v.<sup>2</sup>).

<sup>25</sup> Biblical translations follow the King James version.

In his forthcoming study of the Norse-derived terms recorded in the Middle English poem *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, Dance (Dance forthcoming b) hypothesizes, together with Kullnick (Kullnick 1902), that ME *daren* with the sense ‘to cower, shrink’, which is mainly recorded in northern and alliterative texts, may be Norse-derived (cp. MnSwed. *darra* ‘to tremble, shiver’), and does not fully reject the possibility that the Old English verb may share the same etymology. While this could indeed be the case, given that the text does not record any other Norse-derived terms, that there may exist cognates in other West Germanic languages (cp. MDu. *bedaren* ‘to appease, abate, compose, calm’ and Fl. *verdaren* ‘to astonish, amaze’, as suggested by the *OED* entry; cf. above, 2.1), and that the evidence for the Norse-derivation of the term is in no way stronger than that in favour of its native origin, the Old English verb is not considered here to be Norse-derived, which does imply that its Middle English reflex might not have been influenced by the Norse term.<sup>26</sup>

(N) OE *drūping* ‘sluggishness, torpor’: While this deverbal noun, which is only attested as far as the *OEC* is concerned in an Old English translation of a letter from Boniface (Wynfrið) to Eadburga recorded, possibly in Worcester, in an eleventh-century manuscript (viz. London, British Library, MS Cotton Otho C.i; see the *DOE*: s.v. *drūping*, and Ker 1990: no. 182), is not commonly attributed a Norse origin by scholars, what seems to be its Middle English reflex (viz. ME *droupyng* ‘torpor, troubled sleep’) is commonly identified as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *drúpa* ‘to droop, hang one’s head’; see, for instance, Björkman 1900–02: 176–77 n. 1, the *MED*: s.v. *droupen*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *droop*). However, given the attestation of the term in a text that does not otherwise show any Norse influence (see Sisam 1923: 258–62), the existence of direct cognates in other West Germanic languages (cp. MDu. *drūpen* ‘to drip’; cf. above, 2.1), and the verb’s similarity to native verbs expressing the same concept (cp. OE *stūpian* ‘to stoop’ and *dropian* / *drupian* ‘to droop’), it seems better to consider OE *\*drūpian* and the Norse verb to be cognates (cp. Holthausen 1934: s.v. *drūping*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *drúpa*, Orel 2003: s.v. *\*ðrūpōjanan*, Dance 2003: 446, and Dance forthcoming b).<sup>27</sup>

(O) OE *-efen*: see above, 2.4.2.F.

<sup>26</sup> I am very thankful to Dr Richard Dance for having brought this term to my attention and for having supplied me with his analysis of the term’s etymology. The discussion above heavily relies on his notes, to appear in Dance forthcoming b.

<sup>27</sup> I am very thankful to Dr Richard Dance for having brought this term to my attention and for having supplied me with his analysis of the term’s etymology. The discussion above heavily relies on his notes, to appear in Dance forthcoming b.

(P) OE *eorcnanstān* ‘precious stone’: Serjeantson (Serjeantson 1935: 69), followed by Kisbye (Kisbye 1982a: 50), suggests that this compound is a Norse-derived loan-blend (cp. OIc *jarknasteinn* ‘glittering gem’ and OE *stān* ‘stone’). She explains that the determinant is likely to be a Middle Eastern loan-word itself, the Chaldaic word for ‘topaz’ being *jarkān* and the Aramaic word for ‘yellow jewel’ being *jarkā*. Admittedly, the fact that the determinant of the compound shows some variation (‘*eorcnan-*’, ‘*eorcna-*’, ‘*eorcla-*’; see the *DOE*: s.v. *eorcnan-stān*, *eorcna-stān*, *eorclan-stān*) may be indicative of its foreign character (cp. Sievers 1887: 182). However, the attestation of the compound seems to argue against this because it is recorded in texts where we would not expect Norse influence (e.g. Phoen 603, El 1024, etc.; see the *DOE*: s.v. *eorcnan-stān*, *eorcna-stān*, *eorclan-stān*). We could bring forward the fact that the Scandinavians had trade contacts with the Middle East (see Jansson 1988 and Roslund 1997: 283) as further evidence in favour of the Norse derivation of the term, but this argument is not very reliable either. On the one hand, the Anglo-Saxons are also known to have had direct and indirect contact with this area (see Scarfe Beckett 2003: ch. 3). On the other hand, even if the root has been borrowed from the Middle East, the borrowing process may be attributable to an earlier stage. Orel (Orel 2003: s.vv. *\*erkna-stainaz* and *\*erknaz*) associates the determinant with PGmc *\*erknaz* (cp. Go. *unairkns* ‘impure’, and OHG *ercan* ‘holy, sublime’; cp. Go. *airkniþa* ‘genuineness’), and Lehmann hypothesizes that these terms may reflect a ‘cross-cultural term taken over in late PIE, which lacked a word for silver’ (Lehmann 1986: s.v. *airkniþa*). These arguments have led most scholars to reject the Norse derivation of the term (see Sievers 1887: 182–83, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *eorc(n)an- eorclan-stān*, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *jarknasteinn*, who, following Bugge 1910a: 55, analyses the Norse term as a loan-blend based on the Old English compound).

(Q) OE *ēðelstæf* ‘sustainer of the homeland’: This compound is only attested in the Old English poem *Genesis A* (viz. GenA,B 1118 and 2225). Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §114, and Hofmann 1957: 11–12) has suggested that it might be a Norse-derived loan-translation (cp. OIc *áttstafr* ‘kinsman, kindred’). There is, however, no reason to argue against a fully native derivation for the compound, especially when we consider that *Genesis (A and B)* does not otherwise show any Norse influence (cp. Peters 1981: 109, and the *DOE*: s.v. *ēðel-stæf*).<sup>28</sup> Irving (Irving 1959: 4) has pointed out that the scribe of *Genesis*

<sup>28</sup> On the date of composition of the so-called *Genesis A*, see Doane (Doane 1978: 36–37), who points out that it is similar to *Beowulf*, *Exodus*, and *Daniel* in style, vocabulary, and metre.

seems to have been unfamiliar with the form because he spelt it <edulf stæfæ> (GenA,B 1118) and <eðylstæf> (GenA,B 2225). Yet, as he explains, there are several possible reasons for this:

it may have been a rather rare word, by chance not preserved elsewhere in the poems that have survived; it may have been a dialectal word, perhaps Anglian; it may have been an old word which became obsolete in later centuries. (Irving 1959: 4)

(R) OE *fēre* ‘accessible; able to go, fit for military service’: Heidermanns (Heidermanns 1993: 205–06) explains that PGmc *\*fōriz* has reflexes in North and West Germanic with passive (‘accessible, walkable’ > ‘suitable, adequate’) and active (‘mobile, able’ > ‘capable, fit’) meanings. The semantic difference between active and passive meanings is not always easy to establish, though. However, it seems to be the case that North Germanic reflexes do record an active meaning (e.g. OIc *færr* ‘able to go, fit for use; capable of being passed’), while the West Germanic reflexes are rather associated with a passive meaning (e.g. OFris. *fēre* ‘conductive’, OHG *gifuori* ‘appropriate, suitable’; cp. OFris. *fēre* ‘benefit, profit’, OS *gifōri* id., OHG *gifuori* id.). The latter description also fits OE *fēre*. It is only recorded once as a simplex meaning ‘accessible’, viz. in Phon 4, where it is applied to a stretch of land (cp. OE *ēarfodðfēre* ‘difficult to travel over, hard to traverse’, *ēaðfēre* ‘easy for travelling over’, etc.). Given that the meanings ‘of people; able (to go); fit (for military service)’ and ‘of ships: serviceable, seaworthy’ are not recorded before the eleventh century (see the DOE: s.v. *fēre*, adj.), they are commonly analysed as having developed under the influence of the Viking Age Norse cognate represented by OIc *færr* (see Björkman 1900–02: 237, Hofmann 1955: §309, de Vries 1961: s.v. *færa*, Peters 1981: 97, the OED 1989: s.v. *fere*, a., Dance 2003: 351, and Dance 2011: 96). However, OIc *færr* shows that the association of the passive and active meanings can be accomplished by native means and a similar development could be claimed for the Old English adjective (cp. Förster 1925b: 30 n. 70, the MED: s.v. *unfēre*, adj., Heidermanns 1993: 205–06, and Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.v. *fere* 1). A native semantic development would be fully in keeping with the fact that the new meaning is already attested in the *Life of Machutus*, a text which should

Given the uncertainty about the dating of *Beowulf*, Doane’s comment that the dating of *Genesis A* ‘must be on a sliding scale’ seems very appropriate. However, he concludes his analysis by saying that ‘any date in the eighth century seems reasonable, and there are no reasons against the old assignment of the poem to Bede’s Northumbria, though a Mercian or south-western home is also possible’ (Doane 1978: 37). Doane (Doane 1978: 18) dates its manuscript, Oxford, Bodleian Library MS Junius 11, to c. 1025.

be dated to the late tenth or the early eleventh century. The place of origin of the text remains unclear, though. Yerkes (Yerkes 1984: xxxvi–xlii) suggests Winchester as a strong possibility, while Hofstetter (Hofstetter 1987: 230–32) relies on lexical and phonological features to argue in favour of a Mercian origin;<sup>29</sup> in his view, a Mercian exemplar would have acquired some West Saxon and Kentish features through the process of transmission. If that is the case, it is not clear whether the use of OE *fēre* should be associated with the hypothesized Mercian original or with the later process of transmission. Furthermore, the complex OE *unfēr* is already recorded in the mid-tenth-century Cleopatra glossaries (CIgI 2 (Quinn) 638; see Ker 1990: no. 143). It is presented there as the lemma of OE *grighund* ‘grey-hound’ (on which see below, III.4.DD), but Meritt (Meritt 1968: 48–49) explains that this is very likely to be the result of a series of misunderstandings: the adjective would have been a gloss for L *leprosus* ‘leprous’, L *leprosus* became confused with the original lemma in the glossary, L *leporarius* ‘dog that kills hares, grey hound’ (see *DMLBS*: s.v. *leporarius*), and the gloss for the former ended up replacing it as a lemma. The association of the English adjective with leprosy is repeated in the Middle English *Genesis and Exodus* (see Arngart 1968: l. 2810, cp. Exod. 4.6), where it refers to Moses’s leprous hand. Given that these and subsequent attestations of the word-field are not particularly associated with Scandinavianized areas, it seems appropriate to exclude the adjective from the main body of this work.

(S) OE *flota* ‘sailor’: Given that the common meaning for OE *flota* is ‘ship’, Hofmann (Hofmann 1957: 28–29) would like to see its uses in *Exodus*, *The Battle of Brunanburh*, and *The Battle of Maldon*, where it means instead ‘sailor’, as cases of a Norse-derived semantic loan. However, as Irving (Irving 1959: 9) notes, the term has the same meaning in the Old English poem *Solomon and Saturn* recorded in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 422 (a poem probably from the tenth century; see above, III.1.10.B), and OIc *flotnar*, to which Hofmann attributes the uncommon meaning of the English term, actually means ‘men’ in general, not ‘sailors’.

(T) OE *folcstede* ‘battlefield’: Hofmann explains that, given that OE *folcstede* in GenA,B 2000 means ‘battlefield’ and not ‘dwelling-place’, as is normally the case (cp. GenA,B 1933 and 2203), it may be the case that the determinant of the compound is a Norse-derived semantic loan (cp. OIc *fólk* ‘battle’) (Hofmann 1957: 13–14). However, as Irving (Irving 1959: 4) points out,

<sup>29</sup> The presence of the effects of second fronting (see Hofstetter 1987: 231) may associate the text with West Mercian rather than East Mercian (see Hogg 1992: §§5.87–92).



this suggestion cannot be easily accepted, not only because OE *folc* commonly means ‘army’ but also because the compound has the same meaning in Beo 1463, which makes Norse influence unlikely.<sup>30</sup>

(U) OE *fōn* ‘to take, grasp, seize’: The verb tends to be used in Old English texts with an active sense (see the *DOE*: s.v. *fōn*). There are, however, some contexts where it has a rather passive meaning. These are quoted in the *DOE* (s.v. *fōn*, senses 7 and 8). The *DOE* presents the meaning ‘to get, receive, suffer (a wound, injury)’ (sense 7) as a native derivation (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *fōn*, sense 4.b.b), while ‘to meet with, experience, encounter (bad weather)’ (sense 8), which is only recorded in ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.56, is associated with Old Norse usage. This association may rely on the fact that Hofmann would like to consider the latter usage to be Norse-derived on the basis that OIc *fá* is commonly attested with OIc *veðr* ‘weather, wind’ indicating either experiencing bad weather or getting much or little wind (Hofmann 1955: §362). There is, however, no clear reason to separate ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.56 from the contexts which the *DOE* presents under sense 7. Only the apparent rarity of the collocation and the attestation of other Norse-derived terms in the annal (e.g. OE *cuman tō wiðermāle*, *ūtlagian*, *ūtlaga* / *ūtlah*, etc.) could be brought forward as factors in favour of analysing the use of OE *fōn* in the D-text as Norse-derived. These reasons, however, do not seem to be strong enough to grant the inclusion of the expression in the main body of this work.

(V) OE *foreword* ‘provisions, terms, conditions’: Steenstrup (Steenstrup 1882: 55) is the main advocate in favour of analysing this term, first recorded in MtGl (Li) 5.18, as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *forvǫrðr* ‘swearing’; PGmc \**warduz*), while Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 12) simply points out that its etymology remains unclear. Steenstrup associates OE *foreword* with the Old English cognate of OIc *forvǫrðr* ‘swearing’, viz. OE *foreweard* ‘contract, agreement; provisions, terms’ (cp. *OED* 1989: s.v. *foreward*, n.), and sees the presence of /o/ instead of /æa/ in the root as suggesting Norse origin. However, as he points out himself, the Norse derivation of the term might be doubted on the basis that the Danish and Swedish sources where the Norse term is fairly common with the meaning ‘condition, term’ date from the fourteenth century or later. It seems more likely that OE *foreword* should be associated instead with OE *forewyrð(e)* ‘provision, agreement’, which is already recorded in CorpGl 2 (Hessels) 1.579 glossing L *antefata* ‘those things which are said /

<sup>30</sup> We should remember, though, that some scholars have attempted to see Norse influence on this poem as well; their efforts, however, have not been successful (see Dance 2004: 2–3).



agreed upon before hand, terms, conditions' (cp. the *DOE*: s.v. *foreword*).<sup>31</sup> This association relies on the partial synonymy of OE *word* 'word, speech, sentence, statement' and OE (*ge*)*wyrde* 'speech, conversation'; this semantic connection stems from the fact that they derive from two by-forms of the same root (viz. PGmc *\*wurðan* and *\*wurðjan*, respectively; cp. Orel 2003: s.vv. *\*wurðan* and *\*wurðjan*, and Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.v. *-warde*).

(W) OE *forwegen* 'killed': Hofmann would like to explain this past participle, which is only recorded in Mald 228, by associating it with OIc *vega* 'to smite, slay, kill' (Hofmann 1955: §295). See, however, Pons-Sanz (Pons-Sanz 2008: 435) for an argument in favour of its native derivation.

(X) OE *full*: Kniezsa (Kniezsa 1994: 241) would like to interpret this adjective, when it collocates with OE *cyning* 'king' and means 'entitled to all the privileges implied in a designation' in ChronD (Cubbin) 1013.27 and ChronE (Irvine) 1036.16, as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *full* 'full'). There is, however, no reason to separate these attestations of the adjective from others where it generally means 'not deficient or partial, full, complete, entire, perfect' (see the *DOE*: s.v. *full* sense 5).

(Y) OE *fylcian* 'to arrange, draw up, marshal (troops for battle)': The possible Norse derivation of OE *gefylce* 'troop, band, army' (cp. OIc *fylki* 'county, shire; host in battle'), suggested by Smith (A. Smith 1951: 27), has been rejected by Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §225) and Peters (Peters 1981: 109–10) on the following grounds:

(Y.1) the spellings <gefylcio>, <gefylceo>, and <gefylcium> (see the *DOE*: s.v. *gefylce*, *gefylc*) suggest that the velar consonant has undergone palatalization;

(Y.2) the presence of the prefix points towards native rather than Norse derivation (but cf. OE *geeggian*; see above, 2.2.2.1.B); and

(Y.3) it is already attested in the Old English version of the *Cura Pastoralis* (viz. CP 21.161.6).

While the noun is most likely a native term etymologically related to OE *folc* 'people, nation; troop, army' (cp. Holthausen 1934: s.v. *ge-fylce*), the verb OE *fylcian*, which is only recorded in ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1066.60 and ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.46, is commonly analysed as a Norse-derived loanword (cp. OIc *fylkja* 'to draw up (troops)'; see Björkman 1900–02: 210, de Vries 1961: s.v. *fylki*, Hofmann 1955: §372, Peters 1981: 94, Kisbye 1982a:

<sup>31</sup> Given the structural similarity between the Old English and the Latin terms (cp. L *ante* 'before' and *fatus*, past participle of L *fari* 'to say, speak'), it may be the case that the Old English term is in fact a loan-translation of the Latin model.

50, and the *DOE*: s.v. *fylcian*). However, scholars do not tend to present any clear reason for its Norse origin (other than the mere existence of the Norse term). In fact, only the late attestation of the term and the presence of other Norse-derived terms in the texts can be brought forward as possible reasons. Admittedly, we would not expect to find an *i*-mutated root vowel in a Class II weak verb (cp. ‘fylcade’ in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1066.60; see A. Campbell 1959: §§754–56); however, the verb could be explained as a native late Old English new formation on the basis of the noun (cp. the synonymous OHG *fulken*; see Karg-Gasterstädt and others 1968: s.v. *fulken*, and Splett 1993: s.v. *folk*), Class II being the largest and most productive class of weak verbs in Old English (see Stark 1982: 16). Old English speakers would not have found the presence of the *i*-umlauted vowel strange because weak Class I ‘W-S [West Saxon] verbs with an originally short root syllable have a strong tendency to join the second weak class’ (A. Campbell 1959: §752; cp. Stark 1982: ch. 4).

(Z) OE *gärmitting* ‘spear-meeting’, *gumena gemōt* ‘assembly of men’, and *wāpenege-wrixl* ‘weapon exchange’: Niles (Niles 1987: 360–61) argues in favour of identifying these three expressions in the *Battle of Brunanburh* (Brun 50, 50, and 51, respectively), which refer to battle as a peaceful or social exchange, as being Norse-derived (cp. Olc *sverþping* ‘sword meeting’, *eggþing* ‘edge-meeting’, and *vápnaskipti* ‘exchange of weapons’; cp. Bjork 2001: 393). This suggestion has been rejected by Carroll (Carroll 2001: 54). She points out that, on the one hand, there are other contexts in Old English texts where battle is described in similar terms (cp. OE *walgāra wrixl* ‘exchange of deadly spears’ in Gen A,B 1990, on which see below, III.4.AAAA; cp. also OE *gūðgeðingu* ‘battle-meetings’ in And 1022 and 1043, *gūðgemōt* ‘battle-assembly’ in Rid 15 26, and *torngemōt* ‘misery-assembly’ in Beo 1140). On the other hand, there is no need to interpret OE *mitting* and *gemōt* as referring to a peaceful encounter because members of the related OE *mētan* ‘to meet’ word-field are also associated with violent encounters (see the *OED* 2000–: s.vv. *meet*, v. sense 6a, and *meeting*, n. sense 2a), while OE (*ge*)*wrixl* is well-attested with the meaning ‘change, interchange, vicissitude’ and ‘requital’ (see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.vv. *ge-wrixl* and *wrixl*, sense VI). It is therefore best to agree with Carroll (Carroll 2001: 54) that the compounds under consideration could have easily arisen by purely native means.

(AA) OE (*ge*)*geŋe* ‘troop, company’: Various nouns associated with the same root as OE *gangan* and *geŋan* ‘to go’ are recorded in Old English texts. The euphemistic OE *geŋe*, a weak noun (cp. gen. pl. *geŋena*), renders L *latrina* ‘privy’ in various glossaries (e.g. CorpGl 2 (Hessels) 10.30, and ClGl 1 (Stryker) 3693 = ClGl 3 (Quinn) 1069); in this sense, the term is equivalent

to OE *gang* (see *ÆGl* 315.7, and *AntGl* 6 (Kindschi) 627; cp. OE *earsgang* 'privy'). The idea of 'going together' is clearly presented in OE *gegenga*, which glosses L *conviator* 'companion, fellow traveller' in *HlGl* (Oliphant) C1796 (cp. 'gagenta' in *LdGl* 35.54), and OE *gegencga* 'society, meeting, assembly' (*WÆLet* 2 190) (cp. OS *gigengi* 'succession'). It is most likely that we should associate with these terms the typically Wulfstanian OE *gegenge* (see Ure 1957: 37–38) and its variant OE *geenge* (first attested in *ChronD* (Cubbin) 1043.5). The latter is commonly analysed as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *gengi* 'help, support, troops' < PNGmc *\*zazanzja*; see Hofmann 1955: §343, de Vries 1961: s.v. *gengi*, Peters 1981: 94, the *DOE*: s.v. *geenge*, Kniezsa 1994: 241, and Dance 2003: 422–23), and the Wulfstanian term is similarly analysed. Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §280) argues that Wulfstan's *gegenge* represents an earlier example of the Norse loan-word in which the original prefix in the Norse term has not yet been lost, or a form where the prefix has been added by analogy. Dance, who does not mention the Wulfstanian term, argues in support of the Norse origin of OE *geenge* that 'one finds it difficult to imagine such a useful word (for what is in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle a very common concept) lying hidden in the native language if it had been available beforehand' (Dance 2003: 423; cp. Dance 2011: 97). However, alternative explanations for this absence can be given: e.g. the term may have been a less common variant (or even a Wulfstanian new formation) which was popularized by the Archbishop (cp. OE *hōre*; see below, III.4.LL). Given that a troop is formed by a group of people who have been assembled and who travel together, which narrows the semantic gap between these terms and OE *gegenga* and *gegencga*, there does not seem to be much need to posit foreign influence on these terms (cp. Holthausen 1934: s.v. *geenge*, sense 1, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *ging*, n.).

(BB) OE *gliwstæf*: Dunning and Bliss argue in favour of interpreting the determinant in the compound OE *gliwstæf* (Wan 52), which they translate as 'joyfully', as Norse-derived on the basis that OE *gliw* often meant 'entertainment', especially 'musical entertainment', whereas in this case the meaning of OIc *glý*, viz. 'joy', seems more appropriate (the *DOE*: s.v. *gliw-stafas* translates the compound as '(signs of) joy; perhaps specifically: songs') (Dunning and Bliss 1969: 58). However, this suggestion is not free from problems. On the one hand, the meaning 'joy, mirth' could have easily developed by native means given the association of the term with play and entertainment (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *glē*, n.1, senses 2.a and 2.b). As noted by Leslie (Leslie 1966: 76 n. to l. 52), the compound under consideration would belong to a well-attested Old English type where OE *stæf* is combined with an abstract noun, which commonly indicates emotion (cp. OE *sārstæf* 'cutting word, abuse', and *sorgstafas* 'anxiety,

care'). On the other hand, Salmon (Salmon 1960: 8) has suggested that the term should be interpreted instead as 'magic songs, music runes', OE *stæf* having close associations with magical practices. The compound would then refer to the use of music to communicate with spirits, the relatives whom the Wanderer remembers (Wan 51–52; cp. Padelford 1899: 77, where the term is translated as 'melody'). Furthermore, a native origin for the compound would be fully in keeping with its attestation: *The Wanderer* is included in Exeter, Cathedral Library, MS 3501, i.e. the so-called *Exeter Book*, a manuscript originating from the West Country c. 1000 (Ker 1990: no 116; cf. above, 2.1).<sup>32</sup>

(CC) OE *gremian* 'to enrage, provoke, irritate': Kniezsa (Kniezsa 1994: 241) analyses this verb in ChronE (Irvine) 1104.24 as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *gremja* 'to anger, provoke, exasperate'). Yet, there is no reason not to associate this occurrence of the verb with its other attestations in Old English texts (see the DOE: s.v. *gremman*, *gremian*; cp. Orel 2003: s.v. *\*zramjanan*).

(DD) OE *grīghund* 'greyhound': Given that direct cognates of the term, which is only attested as far as Old English texts are concerned in the Cleopatra glossaries (ClGl 2 (Quinn) 638; see above, III.4.R), are restricted to Old Norse (cp. OIc *grey* 'bitch' and *greyhundr* id.), this compound has sometimes been analysed as Norse-derived (e.g. Skeat 1892: s.v. *greyhound*). However, even though it is recorded as <greihund> in the Latin rendering of LawIICn 80.1b recorded in the *Quadripartitus*, it seems better to consider that the compound represents the native reflex of the Proto-Germanic root (viz. PGmc *\*zrawjan*; cp. eWS *\*grieg-*), rather than a loan from its Viking Age Norse cognate (see, for instance, Björkman 1900–02: 66, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *griēg-hund*, the MED: s.v. *grē-hound*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *grey*, the DOE: s.v. *grīg-hund*, the OED 1989: s.v. *greyhound*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*zrawjan*).<sup>33</sup>

(EE) OE *gūðhafoc* 'battle-hawk': This hapax legomenon is attested in Brun 64, where it seems to refer to the *earn* 'eagle' mentioned in Brun 63. Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §230) would like to interpret the compound as an example of the influence of the Norse skaldic technique in England because, he argues, it is very uncommon to find one species as the base of a kenning referring to another species. Hofmann's suggestion has gained some acceptance (see Niles

<sup>32</sup> Bibire associates the poem with other wisdom poems, such as *Hávamál*, although he admits that 'such wisdom-poetry is very likely to have been inherited by both English and Norsemen' (Bibire 2001: 102).

<sup>33</sup> I am very thankful to Dr Richard Dance for having brought this term to my attention and for having supplied me with his analysis of the term's etymology. The discussion above heavily relies on his notes, to appear in Dance forthcoming b.

1987: 359, Harris 1986: 62, the *DOE*: s.v. *gūþ-hafoc*, Bjork 2001: 393, and Carroll 2001: 50). Hofmann notes the attestation of OE *hearoswealwe* 'sword-swallow' referring to a hawk in Fort 86, but does not give it any significance on the basis that 'paßt sie nicht zur nordischen Kenningtechnik' (Hofmann 1955: §230). Whether this compound can be associated with the Norse skaldic practices or not, it is treated as a kenning in the strictest sense of the word by Gardner (Gardner 1969: 112; cp. Merwe Scholtz 1927: 74, and Kitson 1997a: 495), and it is an indication that the use of one species of bird to refer to another was not fully alien to the Anglo-Saxons.<sup>34</sup> When this is associated with the fact that the eagle is otherwise also referred to by means of a compound with OE *gūð* as the determinant, viz. OE *gūðfugol* 'bird of war' (Rid 24 5), the necessity to bring into the discussion the Norse expression *gunnar haukr* 'hawk of battle' (e.g. in the first of the *lausavísur*, st. 1 l. 7, by Hromundr halti, edited by Jónsson 1912: 95–96) diminishes significantly. Accordingly, there does not seem to be much evidence in favour of including the compound in the list of Norse-derived terms in Old English (cp. Townend 2000a: 359, and Jesch 2001a: 258, where it is argued that the beasts of battle passage in the poem is 'lexically and stylistically like the other OE examples').<sup>35</sup> The kenning can be taken as an indication that 'the poets were alert to the difference between type and cliché' (Griffith 1993: 195).

(FF) OE *hæfen(e)* 'haven, port': This term is commonly interpreted as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *hofn* 'haven, harbour'; see, for instance, Björkman 1900–02: 242, Hofmann 1955: §334, de Vries 1961: s.v. *hofn* 1, Peters 1981: 88, and Dance 2003: 359). There is, however, nothing in its phonological form to suggest that this may be the case. OIc *hofn* is likely to derive from PGmc *\*xabanō* and OE *hæfen(e)* could easily record a native English reflex of this term. Indeed, Luick (Luick 1964: §382 Anm. 1) argues that, while OE *hæfen(e)* is a native term, ME *havene*, commonly attested in texts written in a dialect where we would expect to find <e> instead of <a> (i.e. in texts written in the AB dialect or Kentish; see d'Ardenne 1961: 99, s.v. *havene*), derives

<sup>34</sup> OE *stæðswealwe* lit. 'shore-swallow' and *sæswæalwe* lit. 'sea-swallow' as references to a sand-martin could also be brought into the discussion, but the fact that both the swallow and the martin belong to the family of the *Hirundinidae* may reduce the relevance of the examples (cp. OE *nihthrōc* 'night-rook' as a reference to a raven in PsGII (Lindelöf) 101.7; see Griffith 1993: 188). On Old English names for birds, see further Kitson 1997a and Kitson 1998.

<sup>35</sup> See Merwe Scholtz 1927: ch. 5 and Olsen 1995 on the similarities between Old English and Old Norse kennings (in a broad sense) with regard to the etymology and reference of the base word. See Gardner 1969 for a discussion of the different ways in which the word *kenning* is commonly used by scholars.

from the Norse-derived OE *\*hafn(e)* (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *hāven*, n.1). Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §334) rejects this possibility and hypothesizes instead that OE *hafen(e)*, where he would like to see the substitution of the expected /æ/ for the VAN [ɔ] - [a],<sup>36</sup> is the general form that the loan-word adopted in Old English, while *\*hafene* is the form which the loan-word adopted in the dialects where the sound change /æ/ > /e/ had left a clearer difference between /a/ and /e/ (on OE /æ/ > /e/, see Hogg 1992: §§5.87–92, and 5.189–91). However, besides the not unlikely possibility that a native form coexisted with a Norse-derived by-form, ME ‘havene’ instead of *\*hevene* in these texts can be explained as a result of various factors: e.g. (1) the influence of other dialectal varieties; (2) the association of this term with the related verb OE *habban* / ME *hāven* (see Orel 2003: s.vv. *\*xaban*, *\*xabanō*, and *\*xabenan*), whose forms also exhibit <a> instead of the expected <e> (see d’Ardenne 1961: 98, s.v. *habbe(n)*); and (3) the association of the term with the related noun OE *hæf* ‘sea, ocean’, which would have adopted the form *haf* in some oblique cases.

The attestation of cognate terms in other West Germanic languages (MLG *havene* ‘harbour’, MHG *habene* id.) could be taken as a factor in favour of the native derivation of the term, albeit not a definitive one (cp. Smith 1970: s.v. *hafn*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *haven*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*xabanō*; cf. above, 2.1). Yet this issue is also slightly problematic. Kluge (Kluge 1995: s.v. *Hafen*<sup>2</sup>) argues that the Middle High German form was borrowed from the Middle Low German term, which was in its turn borrowed from the Viking Age Norse term. This view is, however, not generally accepted; the Middle Low German noun is more frequently presented as a cognate of the Norse term (cp. de Vries 1961: s.v. *hofn* 1, Magnússon 1989: s.v. *höfn* 1, Orel 2003: s.v. *\*xabanō*, and Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.v. *hef*).

Hofmann brings up the association between the use of the term and Sandwich in Ch 959 (Rob 82) 17, 24, 26, 28 (cp. ChronA (Bately) 1031.3 and 5 = ChronF (Baker) 1029.3 and 4; see above, II.32, on the relationship between these texts) as further evidence of the Norse origin of the term because ‘dies war fur die Dänen einer der wichtigsten Häfen in England’ (Hofmann 1955: §334: ‘this was one of the most important harbours in England for the Danes’). This type of evidence, however, does not carry much weight.

One further argument which could be given in favour of the Norse origin of the term is its attestation together with OE *taperex* in Ch 959 (Rob 82), which

<sup>36</sup> The Viking Age Norse noun would have had [ɔ] in the singular except for the genitive and [a] in the plural except for the dative; cp. Heusler 1950: §§208–12.



may represent its first record (see above, II.32; on OE *taperæx*, see above, 2.5.S). Given that the text is supposed to record a grant by Cnut to Christ Church, Canterbury, it could be argued that the document records the language of Cnut's Anglo-Danish court. After all, the methods of measuring the extent of the grant (i.e. the distance a taper-axe could be thrown from a floating boat at high tide) seem to have been employed not only by the Anglo-Saxons (cp. Ch 645 (Birch) 994 20–21; see also Brooks 1984: 386 n. 111), but also by other Germanic peoples (see Napier and Stevenson 1895: 138 n. to l. 16, with references). This type of speculation is, however, highly risky, especially when we consider that the relationship of the extant text with a possible Cnutian original remains unclear.

The Old English noun is mainly attested with forms that belong to a strong feminine noun (e.g. 'hæfene', gen. sing. in ChronA (Bately) 1031.5 = ChronF (Baker) 1029.4); however, it is also attested as 'hæfenan', acc. sing.(?), in ChronE (Irvine) 1090.6,<sup>37</sup> which suggests a weak noun. Admittedly, morphological uncertainty and variation is one of the characteristics of the process of integration of loan-words into the borrowing language. However, the existence of weak and strong forms side by side is by no means uncommon for native nouns.

In a nutshell, the only clear arguments in favour of the Norse derivation of OE *hæfen(e)* are its late attestation and the existence of a Norse term with which it can be associated. However, as suggested above, 2.1, this type of evidence is highly unreliable. Furthermore, it is important to bear in mind that most of the late Old English texts recording the term can be associated with Canterbury or surrounding areas, which may indicate that the noun started life in Old English as a dialectal term, and it was only at the end of the Anglo-Saxon period that it made it to the written language.

(GG) OE *handplega* 'fight, battle' and *plega* 'fight, battle': Hofmann (Hofmann 1957: 14–15) presents a very convoluted argument in order to associate these terms, recorded in Brun 25 and 52, GenA,B 1989 and 2057, Ex 327, and ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 1004.19 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1004.19, with Norse usage. Given that there is no equivalent in Old Norse to OE *plega*, he suggests that these terms show the same metaphoric associations as OE *walgāra wrixl* and *wæpengewrixl* (cp. OIc *skipta vápnum*). Yet, as in the case of these

<sup>37</sup> OE 'hæfenan' in ChronA (Bately) 1031.3 may be an error induced by the presence of OE *on* following the term, especially if we accept Baker's (Baker 2000: xliii) suggestion that this annal and the 1029-annal in the F-text of the *Chronicle* were both written by the same scribe (see further above, II.32).



constructions (see above, III.4.Z, and below, III.4.AAAA), there is no strong evidence whatsoever to claim Norse derivation for the terms under discussion.

(HH) OE *herebeorg* 'lodgings, quarters': This term, attested in LS 9 (Giles) 481 (cp. OE *herebeorgian* 'to take up one's quarters, lodge' in ChronF (Baker) 1050.14) has sometimes been analysed as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *herbergi* 'room, lodgings, quarters'; see Treharne 1997: 73). However, other than the late attestation of the term, there is nothing to suggest Norse origin as opposed to a native formation with OE *here* 'army' + *beorg* 'protection, shelter' (cp. OHG *her(e)berga* 'lodging', OS *heriberga* id., MDu. *herberge* id., whence the Norse term may have been borrowed, according to F. Fischer 1909: 7, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *herbergi*; see Förster 1925b: 27 n. 58, the MED: s.v. *herberwe*, A. H. Smith 1970: s.v. *herebeorg*, the OED 1989: s.v. *harbour, harbor*, n.<sup>1</sup>, Dance 2003: 449, and Dance 2011: 106).

(II) OE *heoruwulf* 'warrior' and *hildewulf* 'warrior': Hofmann (Hofmann 1957: 12–13) suggests that these compounds, which are only attested in the poems *Genesis* (GenA,B 2015 and 2051) and *Exodus* (Ex 181), have been coined under Norse influence. He compares them to compounds with OE *freca* 'warrior' as the determinatum, but indicates that the construction might have developed as a result of the fact that the Norse cognate (cp. OIc *freki*) meant 'wolf'. However, compounds with OE *wulf* as the determinatum appear as well in other poems (e.g. *Andreas* and *Maldon*), which could indicate, as Irving (Irving 1959: 9) points out, that such compounds developed by fully native means.

(JJ) OE *hiredmann* 'a member of a hired, retainer, follower': Guntermann (Guntermann 1910: 55 Anm. 3), Kuhn (Kuhn 1956: 38 and 45), and Lindow (Lindow 1976: 50–51) have suggested that the military use of OE *hiredmann* in Mald 261 may represent a Norse-derived semantic loan (cp. OIc *húskarl*; see above, 2.2.1.8.B.4) because OE *hired* 'household, family, retinue' 'was completely domestic in nature, never an instrument of war' (Kuhn 1956: 49). See, however, Pons-Sanz (Pons-Sanz 2008: 435–36) for an argument in favour of native semantic derivation for this use.

(KK) OE 'hird': Kluge (Kluge 1901: 933) suggests that IOE 'hird' (e.g. Ch 1224 (Rob 92) 8, and Ch 1234 (Rob 116) 3) should be identified as a Norse-derived term based on the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *hirð* 'king's or earl's bodyguard' (with /d/ for /ð/; see above, 2.2.2.3), which is itself an Old English loan-word (cp. OE *hired* 'household, family, retinue, community'; see F. Fischer 1909: 21, Hofmann 1955: §47, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *hirð*). However, as pointed out by Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 161), the term under consideration could easily be interpreted as a contracted form of OE *hired*.

(LL) OE *hōre* ‘adulteress’ word-field: The simplex OE *hōre* and the compound OE *hōrecwene* ‘adulteress’, first attested in eleventh-century texts, have been identified as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *hóra* ‘adulteress’, and *hórkona* ‘adulteress’); according to this, OE *hōring* ‘adulterer, fornicator’ should be analysed as a hybrid new formation. See, however, Pons-Sanz 2011 for an argument in favour of the native origin of the word-field (cf. Dance 2011: 100–01).

(MM) OE *hrīmceald* ‘icy cold’: Dunning and Bliss (Dunning and Bliss 1969: 60–61) suggest that this adjective, recorded in Wan 4, should be analysed as a Norse-derived term (cp. OIc *hrímkaldr* ‘rime-cold’). However, given the existence of other compounds with OE *hrīm* or a member of its word-field as the determinant, there is no reason to discount the possibility that the Old English and the Old Norse compounds are independent formations (cp. OE *hrīmforst* ‘hoar-frost’ and OIc *hrímfrosinn* ‘rimy’; cp. Carr 1939: 61, and Leslie 1966: 66 n. to l. 4).

(NN) OE *hrīð* ‘snow-storm’ and ‘hrydg’ (‘storm-beaten?, ruined?’): Dunning and Bliss (Dunning and Bliss 1969: 61) and Bibire (Bibire 2001: 101–02) would like to analyse these terms, which are only recorded in *The Wanderer* (viz. Wan 102 and 77, respectively), as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *hríð* ‘storm, esp. snow-storm’ < PGmc *\*xriþō* < PIE *\*kreit-*). Bibire accepts that the word-field could have a native origin, but argues that ‘two instances within one hundred and fifteen lines, and no instances elsewhere, is an odd distribution, and it is better explained as a Norse loan-word’ (Bibire 2001: 101–02). It may indeed be an odd distribution, but nothing in their form or their context is particularly suggestive of a Norse origin (cp. above, III.4.BB). Furthermore, the direct etymological association of the two terms is not beyond doubt. De Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *hrjóða*) associates OE ‘hrydg’, not with OIc *hríð*, but with the Norse verb *hrjóða* ‘to unload, strip, clear’ (cp. Leslie 1966: 82 n. to l. 77, who argues that the syncope exhibited by the adjective suggests an originally long root vowel). As far as OE *hrīð* is concerned, the existence of OHG (*h*)*rīdōn* ‘to shake, tremble’ may be taken as evidence in favour of its native origin (cp. de Vries 1961: s.v. *hríð*), but as has been suggested before, the use of West Germanic cognates in etymological studies is not free from problems either (see above, 2.1). No definite proof can be given in favour of the Norse or native origin of OE *hrīð*, which does not seem to have survived the Old English period. However, precisely because there is no strong evidence in favour of its Norse origin, while it seems to belong to a word-field which is, at least, North-West Germanic, there is no reason to doubt the native origin of the term (cp. Leslie 1966: 87 n. to l. 102, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*xriþō*).

(OO) OE *infangenedēof* ‘right of judging thieves caught within the limits of one’s jurisdiction, and of taking the fines for the crime’: Kniezsa (Kniezsa 1994: 241) would like to identify this legal term as Norse-derived. There is, however, no reason to analyse it as anything other than a native compound formed by *in* ‘in’ + *fangen* (past participle of OE *fōn* ‘to seize’) + OE *dēof* ‘thief’ (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *infangene-thēf*, Harmer 1989: 78, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *infangthief*).

(PP) OE *læð* ‘a division of a county containing several hundreds’: This seemingly Kentish term (see Robertson 1939: 367 n. to l. 4) appears in coordination with OE *land* in LawBecwæð 3.2, where it seems to mean rather ‘landed possession’ (cp. OIc *lánd* ‘land’). This alliterative phrase may have been constructed following the pattern of the Viking Age Norse phrase represented by OIc *land ok láð* ‘land and lea’ (see Liebermann 1903–16: III, 237 n. to LawBecwæð 3.2, and Olszewska 1933: 82). However, it is likely that the specialized Kentish meaning quoted above derives from the more general meaning recorded in the aforementioned legal code. An initial meaning ‘landed possession’ would fit particularly well one of the most common etymological suggestions which have been put forward to account for this term, viz. its association with OE *unlæd* ‘poor, miserable’ (i.e. without landed property) and Go. *unlêds* id. (see de Vries 1961: s.v. *lād*, Magnússon 1989: s.v. *l. lād*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *lathe*, n.<sup>1</sup>, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*lēðan* and *\*lēðaz*). Similarly, given its alliterative character, the coordination of the term under analysis with OE *land* could have developed independently in the two languages (cp. Ch 1457 (Rob 59) 34, where OE *land* and *læð*, with its Kentish meaning, are associated; cp. other independently developed phrases quoted in Olszewska 1933: 78–79). Thus, its analysis as a Norse-derived formula rests, to a great extent, on the attestation in the same text of other Norse-derived terms (cp. OE *toft* in LawBecwæð 3 and *unsac* in LawBecwæð 3.1), a piece of evidence which is extremely problematic.

(QQ) OE *leccan laga* ‘to pass laws’: Olszewska (Olszewska 1933: 82) argues that this collocation, recorded in ChronE (Irvine) 1086.109, should be analysed as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *leggja log* ‘to pass laws’). Admittedly, in previous texts OE *lagu* and synonymous terms collocate with other verbs, such as OE *lagian* ‘to pass a law, decree’, *settan* ‘to set, establish’, and *ræðan* ‘to decree, decide, advise’, when the concept of promulgation of laws is referred to (e.g. LawIIIATR 0.1; see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 74–76). However, OE *āleccan* ‘to lay; lay aside, abandon’ and *dōm* ‘judgement’ render L *ponere iudicium* in MonCa 1 (Korhammer) 24.4, and the verb collocates in other contexts with terms associated with the legal and moral world (e.g. OE *unriht* ‘injustice’ in WPol 2.1.2

(Jost) 54 = WPol 2.1.1 (Jost) 40, *unlagu* 'bad law, injustice' in LawVAtr 33, etc.). Thus, although Norse influence cannot be fully ruled out, the aforementioned usages of OE *āleccgan* and the echoic character of the combination could have been enough for the expression to derive by native means.

(RR) OE *lending* 'landing, landing place': Ahern (Ahern 1975: 76–77 and 135–37) has suggested that OE 'lædunge' in the phrase 'þurh manega hæfene lædunge' in LS 9 (Giles) 528 should be associated with OIc *leiðangr* 'levy; war tax', and that the whole phrase should 'perhaps be considered as a distinctly medieval metaphor, indicating a lengthy and difficult sea journey', as quoted by Treharne (Treharne 1997: 173 n. to l. 528). However, Lindström (Lindström 2004: 84) argues that 'lædunge', which translates L *applicaciones* (cp. L *applicare* 'to bring to land'), should actually be understood as 'lændunge' and should be associated with the verbal forms 'gelænton' and 'gelænt' in LS 9 (Giles) 105 and 531, respectively. The term should, therefore, be identified with 'gelændinge' in Ch 959 (Rob 82) 17 and, more generally, with OE *lendan* 'to land, arrive'. OE *lending* has sometimes been interpreted as a Norse-derived loan-translation (cp. OIc *lending* 'landing, landing place'; see Robertson 1939: 407, Hofmann 1955: §334, and Peters 1981: 88). However, given the early and widespread records of OE *lendan* (e.g. ChronA (Bately) 886.2), there seems to be no reason, other than the late attestation of the deverbial noun and the mere existence of the equivalent term in Old Norse, to do so. OE *lending* can easily be associated with other strong feminine Old English deverbial nouns with a locative meaning formed with the suffix *-ing* (see Kastovsky 1985: 242).

(SS) OE *lōge*: The etymology of OE 'loge / loga', only attested in late Old English texts in an alliterative phrase with *land* as the other component (e.g. Ch 1098 (Harm 45) 12, Ch 121 (Harm 77) 6, Ch 1149 (Harm 105) 10, and Ch 1150 (Harm 106) 10), remains unclear. Harmer (Harmer 1989: 462–63 n. to l. 12) explains that its association with OIc *logr* 'sea, water' (cf. OE *lagu* 'sea, water'), suggested by Toller (Toller 1921: s.v. *seam*: s.v. *log*; cp. Peters 1981: 97), does not seem appropriate because the term probably means 'produce', 'rents', 'buildings', or 'stock'. Even though no clear explanation can be provided for this term (Harmer 1989: 463 n. to l. 12 mentions a connection with either OE *fēalōg* 'destitute' or *lōh* 'place, stead' as a possibility), Norse derivation does not need to be brought into the discussion.

(TT) OE *mæl* 'speech': Mald 212 records the first words in Ælfwine's exhortatory speech: 'gemunan þa mæla þe we oft æt mædo spræcon', which could be translated as 'let us call to mind those declarations we often uttered over mead'. Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 104) and Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §298) suggest that WS *mæl* in this context may be Norse-derived (cp. OIc *mál*

‘speech’, and. *meli* ‘voice’). See, however, Pons-Sanz (Pons-Sanz 2008: 433–34) for an argument in favour of the native origin of the term.

(UU) OE *magan* ‘to be able to’ in an impersonal construction: Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §293), following Klaeber’s suggestion (Klaeber 1941: 32), hypothesizes that the *Maldon*-structure ‘nu mæg cunnian hwa cene sy’ (Mald 215) may be Norse-derived because in Scandinavian sources it is common to find the auxiliary *mega* ‘to be able to’ without a subject. See, however, Pons-Sanz (Pons-Sanz 2008: 434) for an argument in favour of the interpretation of the structure as fully native.

(VV) OE *mismicel* ‘of varying sizes?’: This adjective only seems to be recorded in Ex 373, where the form is ‘mismicelra’. The ending and the fact that the term is followed by the conjunction OE *ðonne* ‘than’ suggest that we are dealing with a genitive plural form of the comparative grade, but this is somewhat problematic because the comparative form of OE *micel* is normally OE *māra*. This may suggest that the form needs to be emended.<sup>38</sup> Hofmann (Hofmann 1957: 30) prefers to accept the form as it stands and argues that the adjective might have been influenced by Norse usage, where it is common to find adjectives with the prefix *mis-* meaning ‘different, various’ (cp. OIc *mis-langr* ‘of different length’, and *misstórr* ‘of different size’). Yet it seems unnecessary to posit any Norse influence, not only because of the problematic character of the adjective but also because in Old English there exist other terms with a similar structure, particularly the rather common OE *mislic* or *missenlic* ‘unlike, various, manifold’, which may have actually been the term intended by the author (cp. Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *mis-micel*, Irving 1959: 11, and Tolkien 1981: 65 n. to l. 373).

(WW) OE *mundlēow* ‘wash-hand basin’: Holthausen (Holthausen 1934: s.v. *mund* 3. ~*léow*, *léu*, *láu*) would like to derive this compound from the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *munnlau* ‘basin used in washing the hands’ (cp. Carr 1939: 30, and Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *mundlēow*, -*léu*, *láu*). The compound is, however, already recorded in the Corpus and Épinal-Erfurt Glossaries (viz. CorpGl 2 (Hessels) 3.770 and 19.83 and EpGl (Pheifer) 925), which makes Norse derivation very doubtful (cp. Gramm 1938: 87–88, and

<sup>38</sup> Irving 1959: 11 hypothesizes that it could also be the case that the form actually represents the positive grade, given that there may be other cases when a positive adjective is followed by the aforementioned preposition in Old English texts. However, this suggestion is not easily acceptable because Mitchell explains that similar examples in Old English clearly rely on Latin syntax, and the apparently native cases brought forward by previous scholars have to be discounted (Mitchell 1985: §§3213–14).

Peters 1981: 113).<sup>39</sup> Pheifer (Pheifer 1974: 132 n. to 1055) suggests that the determinatum of the compound should not be directly associated with OE *lēag* 'lye, alkalized water' (< PGmc \**lauzō*), a cognate of OIc *laug* 'bath, hot spring', but with OE \**-lēaw* (< PGmc \**lauwō* or \**lauwa-*; cp. L *lavare* 'to wash, bathe'). It may be an example of the fact that PGmc \*/au/ when followed by \*/w/ is sometimes spelt <eu(u)> in the early glossaries (see Pheifer 1974: §40, and A. Campbell 1959: 275; cp. Hogg 1992: §7.73 n. 1). Kross (Kross 1911: 102–03) suggests that only the form 'mundlau' could be considered to be Norse-derived. This form is not attested in the *OEC*, though. The closest variant is 'mundlan'; it glosses L *vescada* (? cp. L *bascuada* 'basket; vessel where cups as washed; article of table furniture') in CIGl 2 (Quinn) 845, where we would not expect to find a non-technical Norse-derived term. While <n> could easily be explained as a mistake for <u>, <a> may represent a dittograph.

(XX) OE *nȳdgylde* 'exaction, tribute': see below, III.4.SSS.

(YY) OE *nȳdmæg* 'blood-relation, cousin': This compound, which is only recorded in the works of Archbishop Wulfstan of York (d. 1023), has sometimes been analysed as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *nauðmágr* 'enforced *mágr* (kinsman)', and *nauð(b)leyti* 'close affinity, relationship'). See, however, Pons-Sanz (Pons-Sanz 2005a).

(ZZ) OE *onnied* 'oppression?': This noun is only recorded in Ex 139, in a passage which is soon followed by a lacuna in the manuscript. This makes its interpretation particularly problematic. It may be that it has the same meaning as OIc *ánauð* 'oppression', but this is not beyond doubt, and, in any case, the terms might be cognates rather than etymon and loan-word (cp. Tolkien 1981: 47 n. to l. 139). Thus, it seems appropriate to agree with Irving (Irving 1959: 10) and consider that Hofmann's analysis of the term as Norse-derived (Hofmann 1957: 30) cannot be easily supported.

(AAA) OE *plōh* 'what a yoke of oxen could plough in a day, plough-land': This term is recorded in late Old English texts (LawBecwæð 3, Rec 24.1 (Rob 84) 24 and 28, and ChronE (Irvine) 1131.7). Its late attestation and its use as a synonym of OE *plōgesland*, a term which is likely to be Norse-derived (see above, 2.4.2.O.2), has led some scholars to suggest that it may be a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *plóg* 'plough'; see the *MED*: s.v. *plough*, Bammesberger 1979: 103–04 with references, Kniezsa 1994: 241, and Bjorvand and Lindeman 2007: s.v. *plog*). However, the existence of cognates in other West Germanic languages (e.g. OFris. *plôch* 'plough', OHG *pfluog* id.) could be interpreted as an indica-

<sup>39</sup> On the date of these glossaries, see Pheifer 1974: §§5 and 14.



tion that we are likely to be dealing with a term (of unknown ultimate origin) common to the Germanic languages, or a term which may have been borrowed from continental Germanic (cp. F. Fischer 1909: 12, Falk and Torp 1910–11: s.v. *plog*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *plógr*, Schmid 1980, Sandred 1966: 324–35, and the *OED* 2000–: s.v. *plough*, *plow*, n.<sup>1</sup>; cf. above, 2.1). Bjorvand and Lindeman suggest that the Norse term is a loan-word from West Germanic which was later introduced into England during the Viking Age (Bjorvand and Lindeman 2007: s.v. *plog*). This would explain why, unlike the other Germanic words, the Old English term is first attested as a reference to a unit of land rather than the implement for ploughing itself. Yet it may be the case that *OE plōh* also had the meaning ‘plough’, but, because of one of Fortune’s whims, this meaning is not recorded until the late twelfth century (see the *MED*: s.v. *plōugh*). Thus, the double meaning ‘plough’ and ‘what a yoke of oxen could plough in a day’ would associate it with *L aratrum* (see *DMLBS*: s.v. *aratrum*), and with two members of the older OE *sulh* ‘plough’ word-field: OE *sulh* and the Kentish *sulling* ‘the fiscal unit corresponding to the hide (or carucate in other counties)’ (see the *OED* 1989: s.v. *suling*). Given the uncertainties surrounding this term, it seems better to exclude it from the main body of the study.

**(BBB)** OE *pylewer* ‘pillow-case’: This compound is recorded in OccGl 45.1.2 (Meritt) 227 (‘pylwere’), one of the scratched glosses to Bede’s *Historia ecclesiastica gentis Anglorum* in London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius C.ii (possibly from tenth-century Canterbury; see above, 2.4.1.A); and in OccGl 28 (Nap) 16 (‘pilewer’), a gloss which, according to Ker (Ker 1990: no. 362), should be attributed to the late eleventh century (cp. above, II.232). OE *wer* in this compound is commonly analysed as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *ver* ‘case, cover’; see Napier 1897: 52, Napier 1900: 222 n. to 16, Björkman 1900–02: 257–58, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *wer*, sense 2, the *MED*: s.v. *pil-wer*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *ver*, sense 2, Peters 1981: 98, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *pilliver*). However, given the attestation of the term in the Tiberius manuscript, the term is more likely to have a native origin. Various explanations could be offered for this form:

**(BBB.1)** Wollmann would like to see the noun as derived from OE *werian* ‘to ward, keep, defend; to clothe, cover over’ (Wollmann 1996: 221), just as OIc *ver* is understood as being related to the Old Icelandic cognate of the Old English verb, i.e. OIc *verja* ‘to cover, clothe’ (see de Vries 1961: s.v. *ver*, sense 2).

**(BBB.2)** Meritt (Meritt 1933: 315–16 n. 105; cp. Meritt 1945: 11 n. to 237) suggests that OE *pylu* ‘pillow’ is likely to have been represented by OE *\*pylwes* and *\*pylwe* in the genitive singular and dative singular, respectively. On the basis of the oblique cases, a by-form *pylwer(e)* could easily have developed



by analogy with other Old English terms meaning 'pillow' which ended in *-r* or *-re*, such as OE *bolster* and *wangere*. The analogous form may have been associated with various terms throughout its history. On the one hand, 'pulewar' in CollGI 25 20 (a gloss in the late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century manuscript Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 730; see below, IV.1.21) and 'peloware' in a fifteenth-century manuscript (see Napier 1900: 222 n. to 16) may suggest an association of the final part of the word with the Middle English reflex of OE *waru* 'guard, defense', viz. ME *wāre*. On the other hand, as suggested by the *OED* (*OED* 1989: s.v. *pilliver*), later *ver*-spellings may derive from the association of the term with ME *pillowbere* 'pillowcase'.

(CCC) OE *rēdan on* 'to proceed against, to take action against': Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §356) and Peters (Peters 1981: 95) would like to interpret the combination of OE *rēdan* 'to advise, decide, rule, govern' and the preposition *on* in ChronE (Irvine) 1048.54, on which see Bosworth and Toller (Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *rēdan* sense III.a), as Norse-derived on the basis of its similarity with OIc *ráða á* 'to attack'. There is, however, no need to bring Norse influence into the discussion because the preposition *on* is not infrequently used in Old English indicating hostile action (see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *on*, sense B.III.2).

(DDD) OE *rēofan* 'to rend, break': This verb is only attested in Ex 464; this leads Hofmann (Hofmann 1957: 30–31) to present it as one of the terms in *Exodus* which, in his view, can be considered to be Norse-derived (cp. OIc *rjúfa* 'to rend, break'). However, given the common attestation of the etymologically related OE *berēofan* 'to bereave, deprive, rob of' in Old English poetry, there is no reason why this verb could not be a fully native term (cp. Irving 1959: 8, de Vries 1961: s.v. *rjúfa*, *rjófa*, and the *OED* 2000–: s.v. *reave*, v.<sup>1</sup>).

(EEE) OE 'rina' ('course'): Kniezsa (Kniezsa 1994: 241) would like to analyse OE 'rina' in ChronE (Irvine) 0.16 as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *renna* 'run, course'; see above, 2.2.2.4.B). However, there is no reason why this term should not be associated with OE *ryne* 'running, course; flow; period of time' (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 0.19 = ChronF (Baker) 0.16).

(FFF) OE *sæccing* 'sacking, pallet': Falk and Torp (Falk and Torp 1910–11: s.v. *seng*) suggest that this Old English hapax legomenon, recorded in Mk (WSCp) 6.55, should be analysed as a Norse-derived term (cp. OIc *sekk* 'sack, bag'). There is, however, no reason to associate this term with the Norse noun instead of OE *sæcc* 'sackcloth', on which see Kross (Kross 1911: 113–14; cp. Feulner 2000: 323, who suggests that the Norse term may in fact be a loanword based on OE *sæcc*, or OFris. *sekk*).

**(GGG)** OE *'sala'* ('sale'): This term renders L *venditio* 'a selling, sale' in AntGl 6 (Kindschi) 440. Given its late attestation (see above, II.6), the fact that other Norse-derived terms associated with trading activities are recorded in Old English texts (e.g. *scinn*; see above, 2.2.2.2.C), and the dialectal distribution of the term in Middle English texts (see the *MED*: s.v. *sale*), the term is sometimes analysed as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *sala* 'sale'; see Serjeantson 1935: 73, Peters 1981: 98, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *sale*, n.<sup>2</sup>, and Kries 2003: 244). However, the existence in Old English of the related verb *sellan* 'to give, supply', which often renders L *vendere* 'to sell' (e.g. *ÆGram* 181.17, *PsGik* (Sisam) 43.13), and the attestation of cognate nouns in other West Germanic languages (e.g. OHG *sala* 'transference of property') point towards the existence of a native noun (cp. Zupitza 1886: 213 no. 37, Björkman 1900–02: 253, Holthausen 1934: *salu*, the *MED*: s.v. *sāle*, n.2, Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. 3. *sel-*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *sala*, Wollmann 1996: 221, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*salō(n)*; cf. above, 2.1). The native noun could have been *\*salu* because, as pointed out by Zupitza, <-a> in the term could be associated with the fact that 'suna' represents OE *sunu* 'son' in AntGl 6 (Kindschi) 184; however, it may also be the case that we are dealing with a weak noun.

**(HHH)** OE *sceard*: This term is commonly recorded in Old English texts as a noun, meaning 'notch, incision, cleft, gap', and as an adjective, meaning 'gashed, notched, cut, mutilated'. Its occurrence in Brun 40 in the clause 'he wæs his mæga sceard, freonda gefylled on folcstede' has caused much discussion. As it stands, 'sceard' seems to be an adjective meaning 'deprived of', a meaning which is not attested anywhere else in the *OED*. As noted by Carroll (Carroll 2001: 48–49), Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §229) would translate this context as 'here was brought about the loss of his kinsmen, his friends', accepting ChronB (Taylor) 937.40 = ChronC (O'Brien O'Keeffe) 937.40 'her' instead of ChronA (Bately) 937.40 = ChronD (Cubbin) 937.40 'he', and translating 'gefylled' as 'brought about' instead of 'destroyed', a meaning more in line with other attestations of the verb (see the *DOE*: s.v. *fyllan*). Accordingly, he suggests that the meaning of the Old English term is likely to derive from the Norse cognate (cp. OIc *skarð* 'notch, hack', which can also be used in the metaphorical sense 'loss'), and that the construction has been influenced by skaldic practice (cp. 'sonar skarð' in st. 6, l. 7 of *Sonatorrek*, a poem attributed to the tenth-century Icelandic poet Egill Skallagrimsson; see Turville-Petre 1976: 32; cp. Niles 1987: 359, and Harris 1986: 62). However, Carroll argues that 'he' seems to be a more appropriate reading because the A- and D-texts are more independent from each other than the B- and C-texts; and that, if 'her' was accepted, the clause could be translated as 'here was his son mutilated', taking

‘mæga’ as a nominative singular, rather than as the genitive plural of OE *mæg* ‘kinsman’. According to this reading, there is no need to postulate Norse influence. Furthermore, even if the adjective is interpreted as meaning ‘deprived of’, this metaphorical meaning could easily have developed by native means: ‘cut, gashed, mutilated’ > ‘cut off from’ > ‘deprived of’ (cp. OE *beheawan* ‘to hew, cut’ as well as ‘to deprive someone of something’; see the *DOE*: s.v. *be-heawan*). Its selection in this context would indicate a very close relationship with the lost kinsmen, one in which they were almost like one single body. Carroll concludes that ‘there are two ways of viewing the matter. The first, that of the sceptic, is that it seems perverse to attach an undue amount of significance to a dubious reading of a problematic line. The second, more optimistic, view is that it is precisely in such difficult lines that foreign influence is to be detected’ (Carroll 2001: 49). The first view is adopted here.

(III) OE (*tō*)*sciftan*: Given that the verbs OE *sciftan* ‘to appoint, ordain, arrange’ and *tōsciftan* ‘to distribute, separate’ are not recorded before c. 1000 and that Middle English texts record, as is the case with other terms with the same initial consonant cluster (see Serjeantson 1935: 76), doublets with /s/ and /sk/ (viz. ME *schiften* vs *skiften*), various scholars have suggested that the Old English verbs might be Norse-derived and might represent the Anglicization of the Viking Age Norse verb represented by OIc *skipta* ‘to arrange, place in order; to take up, occupy’ (see Björkman 1900–02: 9 and 126, Robertson 1925: 305, C. Clark 1952–53: 86, Hoad 1984: 38, and Kniezsa 1994: 241). This may of course be the case; however, nothing in the dialectal distribution of their Old English attestations (approximately twenty in number) supports this etymological explanation. Furthermore, the presence of cognates in various West Germanic languages (OFris. *skifta* ‘to determine’, and MLG *schiften* ‘to divide, exchange’) might be taken as indicative of the native origin of the verbs (cf. above, 2.1). Thus, the evidence in favour of their Norse derivation is not considered here to be strong enough to grant the inclusion of these verbs in the main body of the study (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *shiften*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *shift*, v., and *to-shift*).

(JJJ) OE *scipian* ‘to put in order, man or equip a ship’: this verb, commonly meaning ‘to take ship, embark’ (cp. OE *gescipian* ‘to provide with ships’), is recorded with the sense ‘to put in order, man or equip a ship’ in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1052.7 (‘þa let Eadward cyng scypian XL snacca, ða lagan æt Sandwic manega wucan’ (‘then King Edward had 40 ships embarked [sorted out?] which lay at Sandwich for many weeks’)). Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §365) argues that this uncommon meaning is a Norse-derived semantic loan (cp. OIc *skipa* ‘to arrange, place in order; occupy; to equip, man (a ship)’ (cp.

Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *scipian*). However, as already pointed out by Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 128), the Norse derivation of this verb is not clear. Orel (Orel 2003: s.v. *\*skipan*) argues that the original meaning of PGmc *\*skipan* (> OE *scip* ‘ship’) was ‘structure, framework’ as suggested by the reflexes of the derivative *\*skipōjanan* (viz. OIc *skipa*, OFris. *skipia* ‘to set in order, array’, MLG *schippen* id., etc). The association of the two meanings ‘to embark’ and ‘to prepare a ship, set a ship in order’ could then have easily taken place by fully native means (thus, OFris. *skipia* can also mean ‘to embark’; cp. Peters 1981: 115–16, see also Holthausen 1934: s.v. *scipian*).

(KKK) OE *settan grið* ‘to make peace’: Kluge (Kluge 1901: 938) and Olszewska (Olszewska 1933: 78 and 81–82) suggest that this collocation, first recorded in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1002.5 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1002.5 = ChronE (Irvine) 1002.5, should be analysed as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *setja grið* ‘to make truce’; cp. Hofmann 1955: §302). However, OE *settan* collocates with OE *sibb* ‘peace’ in Jul 200 and HomS 1 (ScraggVerc 5) 79, and with OE *frið* ‘peace, truce’ in LawIIATR 6.1. Thus, the collocation in the 1002-annal seems to reflect rather an old collocation where the direct object has been replaced by the Norse-derived term.

(LLL) OE *settan of* ‘to remove from’: Olszewska (Olszewska 1933: 83) argues that this expression, recorded in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1043.10 and 1050.9–10 with OE *bisceoprice* ‘bishopric’ and OE *māl* ‘pay’, respectively, is Norse-derived because it mirrors OIc *setja af* ‘to depose’ (cp. W. H. Stevenson 1887: 335). However, given that OE *settan* meaning ‘to appoint’ collocates very frequently with a prepositional phrase introduced by OE *tō* (see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *settan*, sense X) and that OE *of* commonly means ‘removal, separation or privation’ (Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *of*, sense VII), the development of OE *settan of* as an antonym of OE *settan tō* could easily have taken place by native means (cp. OE *āsettan of* ‘to depose of, remove from’ in LS 20 (AssumptMor) 378–79 and LawNorthu 2.2).

(MMM) OE *slæting* ‘right of hunting’: Kniezsa (Kniezsa 1994: 241), without further explanation, suggests that this term, only attested as far as the *OEC* is concerned in ChronE (Irvine) 1087.41, is Norse-derived (cp. OIc *\*sleita*, whence PDE *slate* ‘to incite’, see the *OED* 1989: s.v. *slate*, v.<sup>3</sup>). It is, however, more likely that this is a deverbal noun based on OE *slætan* ‘to bait’ (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *slēting* ger.1, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *sleat*, v.<sup>1</sup>).

(NNN) OE *snacc* / *snacc* ‘ship, especially a fast one’: Given the influence of Scandinavian nautical practices (and vocabulary) on Anglo-Saxon techniques and artefacts (see above, 2.2.1.1.B, 2.4.1.A, and 3.4.2.5) and the late attestation of this term (‘snacca’ in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1052.7 =

ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.15 and 'snaccum' in ChronD (Cubbin) 1066.19 = ChronE (Irvine) 1066.11), it has been analyzed as Norse-derived by various scholars (cp. OIc *snekkja* 'swift-sailing ship, war-ship'; see, for instance, Peters 1981: 88, Kisbye 1982a: 49, Kniezsa 1994: 241, Sayers 1996: 286 n. 13, Ridel 2000: 84, and Ridel 2009: 201).<sup>40</sup> However, as noted by Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §365), the *MED* (s.v. *snak*), de Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *snekkja*), the *OED* (*OED* 1989: s.v. *snack*, n.1) and, more recently and in a more thorough study, by Thier (Thier 2002: 34–35; cp. 2009: 154–55), this derivation is problematic, not only because the Norse term suggests a disyllabic as opposed to a monosyllabic word, but also because the Old English term, like OHG *snacca* 'ship with a prow' and unlike the Norse noun and MDu. *snicke* 'light warship', does not exhibit *i*-umlaut (see also Orel 2003: s.v. *\*snakkjō(n)*). Thier points out that, if anything, the Norse term may be a loan-word from West Germanic.

(OOO) OE *sneare* (or *sneareh*) 'snare': This noun, which renders L *tendiculum* (cp. L *tendicula* 'little snare') in AldV 1 (Goossens) 1016 = AldV 13.1 (Nap) 962, has sometimes been interpreted as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *snara* 'snare'; see Björkman 1900–02: 254, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *snéare*, Serjeantson 1935: 70, Pokorny 1959–69: s.v. 2. (*s*)*sner*-, Peters 1981: 98, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *snare*, n.). However, as Björkman himself admits, nothing in its form suggests a Norse rather than a native origin, while the presence of the diphthong (cp. PGmc *\*snarxōn*) and the existence of cognates in several other Germanic languages (cp. OHG *snaraha* 'string, cord' and the related OS *snari* / MLG and MDu. *snare* 'string, cord'; cf. above, 2.1) point instead towards the native derivation of this word (cp. de Vries 1961: s.v. *snara*, sense 1, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*snarxōn*).

(PPP) OE *stefnian* 'to summon' and OE 'stefna' ('summons'): Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §357) claims that ChronE (Irvine) 1048.62 and 1048.64 record two examples of the Norse-derived loan-word *stefnian* (cp. OIc *stefna* 'to summon'; cp. ChronE (Irvine) 1093.12), and that the related noun 'stefna' (attested in ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.39) can also be analysed as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *stefna* 'appointed meeting, summons'), rather than as a native term (cf. OE *stefn* 'voice, sound, message' < PGmc *\*steβnō* and *stefn* 'turn, fixed time' < PGmc *\*stabnjōn*, see Orel 2003: s.vv. *\*stabnjōn* and *\*steβnō*; cp. Steenstrup 1882: 182–83, and Kniezsa 1994: 241). Kisbye (Kisbye 1982a: 60) presents as supporting evidence for the Norse origin of these terms the place-

<sup>40</sup> On the nature of the Scandinavian ship type, see Simek 1979: 31 and Jesch 2001b: 126. On the nature of the Anglo-Saxon ship type, see Griffith 1992.

name *Kesteven* in Lincolnshire, which is commonly associated with the Norse element (cp. Townend 2002: 118, and V. Watts and others 2004: s.v. *Kesteven*). This etymological explanation is by no means unproblematic or generally accepted, though. On the one hand, Hooper (Hooper 1992a: 5) argues that OE *stefna* in ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.39 may have the same meaning as OE *stefn*, i.e. 'a fixed time'; thus, the clause 'setton stefna ut to Lundene' (ChronD (Cubbin) 1052.1.38–39) could be translated as 'they fixed times for coming to London' (cp. Classen and Harmer 1926: 130–31 s.vv. *settan* and *stefn*).

On the other hand, Peters believes that these terms 'sind kaum als Lehnwörter zu betrachten' ('are hardly to be considered loan-words') because of the attestation of OE *gestefnian* in HomU 6 (ScraggVerc 15) 132, a verb to which he attributes the meaning 'to summon, call on a person' (Peters 1981: 92). This association, albeit very likely, is however not accepted by everyone: Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §358) believes that the verb in this context should be associated with OE *stefn* (*stemn*) in its military sense, i.e. 'a fixed time', especially, the period of service of a contingent of the *fyrð* (e.g. ChronA (Bately) 893.28). Scragg (Scragg 1992: 264 n. to ll. 132–33) shares Hofmann's view, and associates the verb with 'stemnetton' (Mald 122).

Another of the reasons provided by Peters against the Scandinavian origin of the verb and noun under analysis is that, in Old English, there existed the verb OE *stefnan* (< PGmc *\*stammnjanan*), the meanings of which, viz. 'to regulate, direct, fix, institute, arrange', could also be associated with that of OE *stefnian* in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*. This suggestion can be seen together with Orel's (Orel 2003: s.v. *\*stebnjanan*) explanation that the reflexes of PGmc *\*stebnjanan*, amongst which he includes OIc *stefna*, OE *stefnian*, and MLG *stevenen* 'to summon', have been influenced by those of PGmc *\*stammnjanan*.

Even though no definite conclusions can be reached, it seems better to agree with de Vries (de Vries 1961: s.v. *stefna* 7), Peters (Peters 1981: 92), and Orel (Orel 2003: s.v. *\*stebnjanan*) on the native origin of the terms under consideration.

**(QQQ)** OE *strīð* 'strife, struggle': While Holthausen (Holthausen 1934: s.v. *strīð*) suggests that this noun is a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *strīð* 'strife, war; distress'), Bammesberger (Bammesberger 1979: 124–15) rejects this possibility on the basis that the term is recorded in GenA,B 284, 575, and 663. He hypothesizes instead that the term may be a loan-word from Old Saxon, where OS *strīð* may be a by-form of the more common OS *strīd* 'fight'. However, as pointed out by Peters (Peters 1981: 117), there is no reason either not to interpret the term as a native derivation (cp. Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.v. *strīd*).

**(RRR)** OE (*ge*)*twinn* 'twin; twofold, double': Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 172) discusses the possible Norse origin of this term in the same con-



text as OE *ðrinna*; thus, the comments on the problematic use of the phonological structure of the latter as evidence of its Norse origin are also applicable here (see above, 2.4.2.W). Björkman admits that the Old English noun *getwinn* ‘twin’ is probably native,<sup>41</sup> but argues that ‘the adjective (originally a different word-stem?) may, very likely, be from Scandinavian’ (Björkman 1900–02: 172; cp. OIc *tvinnr* ‘double’ < PGmc *\*twiznaz* < PIE *\*duisno-*). There is, however, no need to posit Norse origin for the adjective OE *twinn* either. As pointed out by Ross and Berns (Ross and Berns 1992: 646) and Dance (Dance 2003: 407 n. 152), there is no reason to suggest that the noun and the adjective have different origins; they are both likely to derive from PGmc *\*twiznaz*. Indeed, a native origin for the adjective OE *twinn* is fully in keeping with the fact that it is only recorded in the *OEC* in southern texts (AldV 1 (Goossens) 1819 = AldV 13.1 (Nap) 1836, AldV 1 (Goossens) 2529, and AldV 13.1 (Nap) 5085; see above, II.4). Admittedly, it may be the case that, as suggested by the *OED*, ‘in northern ME. [these terms are] perhaps partly or mainly from ON.’ (*OED* 1989: s.v. *twin*, a. and n.); this, however, is beyond the scope of this study (cp. Holthausen 1934: s.v. *twinn*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*twiznaz*).

(SSS) OE *ðegengyld* ‘legal money value of a thane’ and *nýdgýld* ‘exaction, tribute’: While Whitelock (Whitelock 1976: 44 and 59 n. to ll. 108–09) considers these hapax legomena, attested in the Wulfstanian corpus (WHom 20.2 103 = WHom 20.3 106, and WHom 20.2 104 = WHom 20.3 107, respectively), to be loan-translations based on the Viking Age Norse nouns represented by OIc *þegnild* and *nauðgjald* ‘forced payment’, respectively, Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §283) is sceptical for two reasons:

(SSS.1) OIc *nauðgjald* is only recorded in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century Scandinavian texts with a mythological content, where it is a kenning for gold;

(SSS.2) OIc *þegnild* refers to the part of the fine which the king receives when one of his thanes is killed (e.g. Frost. I.2), whereas OE *ðegengyld* refers to the money which a thane should pay if he kills one of his slaves.

Hofmann hypothesizes that, if anything, English usage may have been influential in Scandinavia. This suggestion has recently been supported by Löfving (Löfving 1991: 154) and Syrett, who concludes that ‘there is little sign that *þegn* meant anything more than “freeman, land owner” before the influence of English terminology in the eleventh century’ (Syrett 2000: 268).<sup>42</sup> Thus,

<sup>41</sup> The noun is recorded in various contexts where we would not expect the presence of a non-technical Norse-derived term (e.g. ClGI 1 (Stryker) 2229).

<sup>42</sup> See further Christophersen 1981–82, Strid 1987, Jesch 1993, Jesch 1994, and Jesch



instead of looking for models for OE *ðegengyld* in Scandinavia, we should concentrate on English texts. A possible candidate is OE *ðeofgyld* ‘payment for theft’ (e.g. LawIAtr 1.2 = LawIICn 30.1): both refer to payments made by the guilty party. Similarly, Peters (Peters 1981: 114) argues in favour of considering that Wulfstan coined OE *nýdgýld* himself because (1) *nýd*-compounds are common enough in Old English; and (2) the verb OE *gyldan* ‘to pay, reward, requite’ is already recorded in the oldest Old English texts. Neither Hofmann nor Peters mentions that OE *nýdgýld* is comparable to OE *nēadgafol* ‘tax, tribute’ (LawIVEg 1, 1.3), whose native origin has not been doubted.

(TTT) OE *ungrund* ‘bottomless, enormous in size’: This hapax legomenon is only attested in Ex 509. Given its rarity and Hofmann’s desperate attempts to attribute Norse influence to various terms in this Old English poem, he argues that it might be a Norse-derived loan-translation of the Viking Age Norse terms represented by OIc *úgrunnr* ‘deep’ and *úgrynni* ‘boundlessness’ (Hofmann 1957: 31). Yet the existence of terms such as OE *ungrýnde* ‘bottomless’ and *grundlēas* ‘bottomless, vast’ make Norse derivation of the adjective under consideration very unlikely, as already noted by Irving (Irving 1959: 10).

(UUU) OE *ungylde* ‘not entitled to compensation, unatoned’: This adjective is only attested, as far as the *OEC* is concerned, in LawIIAtr 3.4 (‘licge ungyldre’ (‘should lie unatoned’)), although it also occurs in LawIVAtr 4 (‘iaceat in ungildan ækre’ (‘should lie in an unatoned field’)). Steenstrup (Steenstrup 1882: 356–57), Olszewska (Olszewska 1933: 84), and Peters (Peters 1981: 91) suggest that the use of the Old English term in these contexts should be associated with the Norse expression *liggi í úgildum akri* ‘shall lie in an unatoned grave’ (e.g. SkL 215). However, LawAf 1.5 records the expression ‘licge orgilde’ and this may have contributed not only to Wulfstan’s use of ‘licge ægilde’ in LawEGu 6.7, LawVAtr 31.1 = LawVIAtr 38, LawIICn 48.3 and 62.1 (see Pons-Sanz 2007b: 241), but also to the development of the Æthelredian expression. Given that *un*-derivatives are extremely common in Old English, there is no need to analyse the term under consideration as Norse-derived. It may indeed be the case that the Latin expression in LawIVAtr 4 is a Norse-derived loan-translation (cp. Hofmann 1955: §266) but, given that the present study concentrates on Norse-derived terms recorded in texts written in Old English, the expression is not discussed in the main body of the work (see above, note 2 in Chapter 1).

2001b: 225–27 on the meaning of OWN *pegn* during the Viking Age. Carr also presents OE *ðegngýld* and OIc *pegnildi* as two independent formations (Carr 1939: 82).

(VVV) OE *unræd* ‘foolish plan; crime, mischief’: Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 148–49) suggests that this noun in Ch 939 (Whitelock 16.2) 4 and Ch 1465 (Rob 86) 23 involves an element of treachery which is not commonly associated with it. She hypothesizes that the uncommon meaning for the term may be Norse-derived (cp. OIc *úrǫð* ‘ill-advised step, bad counsel’, which could also be applied to a plan of treacherous murder). Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §390) believes that the same meaning is appropriate for the occurrence of the derivative in ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.11 (cf. ‘unreod’ in ChronE (Irvine) 1075.11). There is, however, no need to posit Norse influence on this meaning. The *OED* (*OED* 1989: s.v. *un-* prefix<sup>1</sup>) explains that the prefix can have a pejorative meaning, even implying evilness (cp. OE *uncoðu* ‘evil disease, plague’, *uncraeft* ‘evil practice, evil art’, and *undæd* ‘wicked deed, crime’). Thus, OE *unræd* could have developed the meaning ‘evil resolution, plan’ by fully native means (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *unrēd*, sense b).

(WWW) OE *unwine* ‘enemy’: This derivative is recorded, not only in two texts associated with the Scandinavianized areas (viz. Ch 1519 (Whitelock 34) 47, and ChronD (Cubbin) 1075.8), but also in texts less clearly localizable and not necessarily associated with these areas (viz. HomM 15 (Wanley) 11.2, recorded in the early eleventh-century London, British Library, MS Cotton Otho A.xiii, and LS 22 (InFestisSMarie) 18; see Ker 1990: no. 173, Gneuss 2001: no. 351, and below, IV.1.13). Given its late attestation and, to some extent, its dialectal distribution, Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §325) would like to analyse this derivative as a Norse-derived loan-translation (cp. OIc *úvinr* ‘enemy’), a suggestion that has been taken over by Peters (Peters 1981: 99). There is, however, no strong reason to discount the possibility that this derivative has been formed by a purely native process adding the prefix OE *un-* with its negative sense (see the *OED* 1989: s.v. *un-*, prefix<sup>1</sup>) to OE *wine* ‘friend’ (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *unwine*).

(XXX) OE *ūpgang* ‘landing, going inland’: Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §306) suggests that the aforementioned meaning, which this term seems to have in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1009.46 = ChronD (Cubbin) 1009.47 = ChronE (Irvine) 1009.43, and ChronE (Irvine) 1046a.9, is a semantic loan derived from the Norse term represented by OIc *uppganga* ‘going ashore’. However, while it seems clear that this is the sense in the second context,<sup>43</sup> the

<sup>43</sup> ‘Þet landfolc hardlice wiðstodon & forwerndon heom ægðer ge upganges ge wāteres & aflymdon hi þanon mid ealle’ (ChronE (Irvine) 1046a.8–10: ‘the local people resolutely withstood and kept them both from landing and from water and completely put them to flight from there’).

same is not so clear for the first context, where we are told that, after midwinter, having attacked London on several occasions, ‘namon hi [the Scandinavian marauders] ænne upgang ut þuruh Ciltern & swa to Oxenaforda & ða buruh forbærndon & namon hit ða on twa healfa Tēnese to scypeweard’ (ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1009.46–48). It may be the case that in this context OE *ūpgang*, which commonly means ‘rising, sunrise; going up, approach, ascent’, simply refers to having taken a route upwards; cp. Swanton (Swanton 2000: 139–40 s.a. 1009), who translates the passage as follows: ‘they took a route up out through the Chilterns, and so to Oxford, and burned down the town, and then carried on along both sides of the Thames towards the ships’ (cp. Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *up-gang*, sense II.b). Interestingly, in these *Chronicle* contexts the term has a strong declensional pattern, while, unprecedentedly as far as Old English is concerned, it may be declined as a weak noun in Mald 87. It has been suggested that, in this context, the term may have adopted not only the meaning, but also the form of the Norse cognate (see Hofmann 1955: §289, cp. Carroll 2001: 41). The seemingly weak ending of the noun is, however, problematic (see Pons-Sanz 2008: 425–26). In Old Norse the idea of going ashore could also be expressed verbally by means of the phrasal expression represented by OIc *ganga upp* (see Jesch 2001b: 179), and this is the meaning that OE *gān ūp* has in various contexts in the *Chronicle* (e.g. ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 997.3–4 = ChronD (Cubbin) 997.3–4 = ChronE (Irvine) 997.3) and elsewhere (LS 29 (Nicholas) 345 and ApT 12.3; see the *DOE*: s.v. *gān*, sense VI.21.e, and cp. sense VI.21.f, ‘to go inland’). It may therefore be the case that the Old English verb + adverb construction is a loan-translation of the Norse expression (see Hofmann 1955: §301, and Peters 1981: 95). However, when assessing these expressions, both the compound and the verb + adverb structure, we should bear in mind that OE *ūp* is attested in similar constructions referring to the motion from sea to land; it is particularly common with OE *cuman* ‘to come, approach’ (see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *up adv.* I, sense a.I, and the *DOE*: s.v. *cuman*, sense E.24.c). Thus, the expression could have developed independently in the two languages.

(YYY) OE *ylde* ‘old people, important people, elders’: While this term commonly means ‘age, period’, it is attested in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1004.17 = ChronE (Irvine) 1004.15 meaning rather ‘old people, important people, the elders’. Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §304) suggests that this collective meaning may be Norse-derived on the basis of the poetic usage of the Norse term (cp. OIc *öld* ‘time, age; poet. men, people’; cp. Peters 1981: 99). He argues that the presence of the uncommon ‘seo yldesta’ in the same context in ChronD (Cubbin) 1004.17 suggests that the original usage was not a common one and

the scribe tried to make sense of it.<sup>44</sup> Hofmann notices that OE *yld* is also used in an Ælfrician context meaning ‘old people’ (viz. ÆCHom II 39.1 291.127), but assigns this usage to Latin influence. Indeed, Ælfric’s choice may have been prompted by the presence of L *maiores* (cp. L *maior* ‘ancestor, forefather, father’) in his source (see Godden 2000: 627). However, on the one hand, his account does not seem to be a slavish rendering of the context of L *maiores*, which may suggest a freer lexical choice on Ælfric’s behalf.<sup>45</sup> On the other hand, if we still want to see the presence of OE *yld* as having been prompted by that of L *maiores*, it could be argued that, had OE *yld* been uncommon in that sense, Ælfric could have easily chosen instead the adjective belonging to the same word-field (cp. ÆLet 4 (SigewardZ) 1201–02, where ‘pine yldran’ renders L *maiores tuos*, as is commonly the case in the canticles of the Psalter, e.g. PsCaK (Sisam) 7[6].7). The collective sense of OE *yld* could, in any case, be associated with the fact that OE *gēogop* ‘youth’ could also be used collectively (see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *geógop*, sense II).<sup>46</sup> Alternatively, it could be understood as a semantic loan from OE *eald* (cp. the DOE: s.v. *eald*, senses I.A.1.d, II.B.1, II.B.3, and III.B.1.b), or from a Latin lemma commonly

<sup>44</sup> Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §390) argues that the superlative form of the adjective is also used unexpectedly in ChronE (Irvine) 1075.11 (‘Pet wæs Roger eorl 7 Raulf eorl þe wæron yldast to ðam unreode’ (‘it was Earl Roger and Earl Ralph who were the chiefs in the foolish plan’)). He points out that the uncommon usage, derived from the fact that the adjective was probably chosen to replace ‘hofdingas’ in the exemplar (cp. ChronD (Cubbin) 1076.11; see above, 4.2.1), lies at both the syntactic and the semantic level. On the one hand, the adjective normally appears with a noun, or is nominalized with an article (as in the example above), but it does not appear — he argues — in predicative position on its own, as is the case in the annal. Yet the aforementioned structure is comparable to ‘se wæs setles eldest’ (Bede 5 14.438.31; ‘who was the chief of those that sat’, as translated by T. Miller 1890–98: 439) and ‘gecwyrðde ðæt he wæs ieldesð ofer ða halgan cirican’ (CP 17.115.16; ‘said that he was the leader in charge of the holy church’). On the other hand, Hofmann points out that, although it can sometimes refer to the leader or the person with most authority, it is not commonly used to refer to the instigator of a plan. However, as suggested by Swanton’s translation, there is no reason not to interpret the nominalized adjective as meaning simply ‘chief, leader’ (cp. Swanton 2000: 211 s.a. 1075). Hofmann hypothesizes that the form in the E-text may in fact be that of an adverb, for OE *ærest* ‘first’ is found in a similar context (viz. ChronE (Irvine) 1087.5). Yet, we should bear in mind that Irvine 2004: cxl–cxliii explains that the omission of inflectional endings altogether in both nouns and adjectives can be found in various annals written by Hand 1.

<sup>45</sup> On Ælfric’s handling of his sources, see, for instance, Pope 1967–68: I, 150–56 and Meaney 1985.

<sup>46</sup> Cp. Ælfric’s ‘seo yld hi gebæd and seo iuguð wrat’ (ÆHom II 39.1 291.127; ‘the old prayed and the young wrote’).

rendered by OE *yld*, viz. L *senectus* (e.g. *ÆGram* 60.9), which could mean both ‘old age’ and ‘old men’ (see Lewis and Short 1879: s.v. *senectus*). This alternative could also account for the suggested lack of familiarity with the term in the D-text of the *Chronicle*.

(**ZZZ**) OE *wælcyrige* ‘witch, sorceress’: In her first edition of Archbishop Wulfstan’s *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, Whitelock (Whitelock 1939: 40 n. 171) suggested that Wulfstan’s *wælcyrige* (e.g. *WHom* 20.3 164–65) should be interpreted as a Norse-derived term (cp. OIc *valkyrja* ‘chooser of the slain’). However, as pointed out by Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §279), this etymological analysis cannot be accepted because the term is already recorded in the *Corpus glossary* (e.g. *CorpGl* 2 (Hessels) 8.87). Whitelock must have become aware of her mistake because the term is no longer suggested to be Norse-derived in the third edition of *Sermo Lupi* (see Whitelock 1976: 64–65 n. 171).

(**AAAA**) OE *walgāra wrixl* ‘exchange of deadly spears’: Hofmann (Hofmann 1957: 14–15) associates this phrase in *GenA,B* 1990 with the compound OE *wāpengewrixl* ‘weapon exchange’ in *Brun* 51 and *WHom* 20.2 100 = *WHom* 20.3 103, and suggests that these expressions might be neologisms which developed in Northern England under the influence of Norse phrases such as OIc *skipta vǫpnum* ‘to exchange weapons’. This suggestion is highly problematic, though, because it is equally likely that this is in fact a traditional poetic formula that developed by fully native means (see Irving 1959: 5, and above, III.4.Z and III.4.GG).

(**BBBB**) OE *wanian* ‘to decay, fade, decline, dwindle’: Kniezsa (Kniezsa 1994: 241) would like to analyse the use of OE *wanian* in *ChronE* (Irvine) 1052.25 (‘he ne wandode na him metes to tylienne’ (‘he did not hesitate to provide himself with food’)) as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *vana* ‘to diminish; reflex. to wane, fade’). There is, however, no reason not to associate the verb with other uses of OE *wanian*.

(**CCCC**) OE *wedbrōðor* ‘pledge brother (in a brotherhood of contract, not of blood)’: Carr (Carr 1939: 31), following Kluge (Kluge 1901: 935), would like to analyse this compound as a Norse-derived loan-translation (cp. OIc *veðbróðir* ‘plighted brother, confederate’; cp. the *OED* 1989: s.v. *wed*, n., sense 6, and Kniezsa 1994: 241). The attestations of the term in the *OEC* would not be at odds with that, because it is only recorded twice and both cases appear in late Old English interpolations (see *ChronD* (Cubbin) 1016.92 and *ChronE* (Irvine) 656.4; see above, II.163.13 and II.163.18). There is, however, no reason why the two compounds could not have developed independently in the two languages (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *wed-brōther*, and Townend 2002: 7 n. 4).

(DDDD) OE *wederfest* 'weather-bound': Given that it is only attested in ChronE (Irvine) 1046b.20, Hofmann (Hofmann 1955: §344), following Kluge (Kluge 1901: 935), suggests that this adjective should be understood as a Norse-derived loan-translation (cp. OIc *veðrfastr* 'weather-bound'; cp. Carr 1939: 31, Peters 1981: 88, and Townend 2002: 203). It is, however, quite likely that it is a native adjectival formation, for OE *fest* is well attested with the meaning 'firmly attached / held fast (to or by something)' (see the *DOE*: s.v. *fest*, sense 2) and it appears in compound adjectives in contexts where it still retains the same meaning (e.g. OE *wiffest* 'bound to a wife, married', and *witefest* 'penally enslaved'). Hofmann goes even further to suggest that the whole structure where the adjective appears, i.e. OE *licgan wederfest*, could be Norse-derived, for the Norse adjective also collocates, amongst other verbs, with the Norse cognate of OE *licgan* (cp. OIc *liggja* 'to lie'). However, given that OE *licgan* appears with a similar meaning elsewhere (e.g. ChronE (Irvine) 1009.4–5: 'hi man þa ealle togædere feroðe to Sandwic, & þær sceoldan licgan' ('they were brought all together to Sandwich, and had to lie there')), this suggestion seems unnecessary.

(EEEE) OE *wit(t)er* 'wise, prudent': This adjective is first attested in the *OEC* in ChronD (Cubbin) 1067.37.<sup>47</sup> Its late attestation has led scholars to suggest that it may be Norse-derived (cp. OIc *vittr* 'wise'; see Björkman 1900–02: 226, Holthausen 1934: s.v. *witter*, Serjeantson 1935: 71, Hofmann 1955: §386, Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *witter*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *vittr*, Peters 1981: 98, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *witter*, a.<sup>1</sup>, Heidermanns 1993: 682, and Dance 2003: 384). However, the attestation of 'witro' as a gloss for L *veror* (cp. L *verare* 'to speak the truth') in CorpGl 2 (Hessels) 19.84, and the significance of the root *wit-* in Old English (cp. OE *wittig* 'wise, sagacious, reasonable') can be taken as evidence in favour of the native origin of the adjective (cp. Dance 2003: 442–43). Indeed, there are many other Old English deverbial adjectives formed with an *r*-suffix (see Lass 1994: 201; cp. OE *slæpan* 'to sleep' > *slæpor* 'drowsy, sleepy'). The close association of the adjective with the OE *witan* word-field is further suggested by the fact that both the adjective and the adverb OE *wit(t)erlice* (on which see below, IV.3.V) are attested in early Middle English texts with the meanings 'certain' and 'certainly' by association with OE *witodlic* 'certain' and *witodlice* 'certainly', respectively (see Dance 2003: 443, with references). Extant evidence then does not seem strong enough to grant the inclusion of this term in the list of Norse-derived words attested in Old English texts (cp. Förster 1925b: 21 n. 26, the *MED*: s.v. *witter*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*witriz*).

<sup>47</sup> On this context, see above, note 14 in Appendix II.



(FFFF) OE *wrang* ‘wrong, injustice’: This term is very frequently attributed a Norse-derived character (cp. OIc *rangr* ‘wry, crooked, wrong’; see Björkman 1900–02: 225, the *MED*: s.v. *wrong*, n.2, Hofmann 1955: §281, de Vries 1961: s.v. *rangr*, Peters 1981: 91, Kisbye 1982b: 61, the *OED* 1989: s.vv. *wrong*, n.2, and *wrong*, a. and adv., and Dance 2003: 387). Yet various factors argue in favour of its native origin:

(FFFF.1) its suggested etymon is a reflex of PGmc *\*wranzaz* (Orel 2003: s.v. *\*wranzaz*), which, like PGmc *\*wranzō* (see below, next word), seems to have referred to the idea of something being bent or crooked (cp. PGmc *\*wrenzanan* > OE *wringan* ‘to wring, twist’, and OHG *ringen* ‘to fight’), and nothing in the phonological structure of the Old English noun suggests that it could not be a native reflex (cf. OE *rōt*; see above, 2.2.2.5);

(FFFF.2) the aforementioned Proto-Germanic root has reflexes in other West Germanic languages (see Pokorny 1959–69: 3. *uer-* E, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *wrong*, a. and adv., Heidermanns 1993: 692–93, s.v. *wranga-*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *wranzaz*): we should bring into the discussion not only MLG *wrank*, *wrange* ‘sour, bitter’ and MDu. *wrangh*, *wranc* ‘bitter, unpleasant, hostile’ (cf. above, 2.1) but also OE *wrang* ‘rough, uneven’, which is attested in Ch 496 (Birch 801) 8. This charter is only recorded in a copy from the thirteenth century (London, British Library, MS Cotton Claudius B.vi, fols 29<sup>v</sup>–30<sup>v</sup>; see Laing 1993: 71–72), but Kelly (Kelly 2000–01: 151–52) points out that the original should probably be dated to 942 and that there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of our copy. The adjective should be associated with ‘wrong-wise’, which glosses L *salebrosos* (cp. L *salebrosus* ‘rough, rugged, uneven’) in AldV 13.1 (Nap) 1770; this gloss was probably written by a twelfth-century hand (see Napier 1900: 47 n. to 1770 and Ker 1990: no. 320). It could be argued that, even if the adjective is native, the meaning ‘unlawful, unjust’ may be Norse-derived. However, the semantic step from ‘twisted, bent, rough, uneven’ to ‘unjust, evil’ seems to be easily accomplished (cp. OE *ðweorh* ‘transverse, bent, crooked; adverse, angry, perverse’ and *wōh* ‘bending, crookedness; perversity, wrong, iniquity’).

The fact that the term is attested as a noun while the suggested etymon is an adjective cannot be taken as strong evidence in favour of its native origin, though (cp. ME *wonte* ‘want, lack’, cp. OIc *vant*, neuter form of *vanr* ‘wanting’; see Dance 2003: 162 and 386). The adjective *wrong* ‘unlawful, unjust’ is first attested in the *Ormulum* (see the *MED*: s.v. *wrong*, adj.), but it is likely to have been used already during the Old English period. We need to consider that the boundaries between nominal and adjectival meaning and form in terms denoting fundamental notions such as *good* or *evil* seem to have been



quite flexible (cp. OE *riht* 'right; justice', and *yfel* 'bad, ill; wickedness'; cp. Bergener 1928: 154).<sup>48</sup>

Other than the meaning of the Old English noun (and the adjective during the Middle English period), the only factor in favour of the Norse origin of the term is its late attestation. It is first recorded in HomU 34 (Nap 42) 303 and 304 = HomU 46 (Nap 57) 16 and 17; HomU 34 (Nap 42) is included in Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 419, which Ker (Ker 1990: no. 68) dates to the first half of the eleventh century.<sup>49</sup> This, however, is not always considered to be enough to grant the term a Norse origin (cp. A. H. Smith 1970: s.v. *wrang*, Magnússon 1989: s.v. *rangur*, Heidermanns 1993: 692–93, s.v. *wranga-*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *wranzaz*), and that is the same opinion held here.

(GGGG) OE *wrang(a)* 'hold of a ship', according to Clark Hall (Clark Hall 1960: s.v. *wranga*); 'rib, framing timber', according to Thier (Thier 2002: 153): This noun has sometimes been attributed a Norse origin (cp. OIc *røng* 'rib in a ship'; see Björkman 1900–02: 225, Serjeantson 1935: 72, Peters 1981: 88, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *wrong*, n.<sup>1</sup>, and Kries 2003: 347). However, the suggested etymon is a reflex of PGmc *\*wranzō* (see de Vries 1961: s.v. *røng*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*wranzō*), and nothing in the form of the Old English term suggests that it could not be a reflex of the same root (cp. OE *wrang*; see above, III.4.FFFF). In fact, the existence of MLG *wrange* 'wale', which shares the same root, and Go. *wruggo* 'snare', an ablaut variant (see Lehmann 1986: s.v. *wruggo*), could be taken as evidence in favour of its native origin (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *wrong*, n.1, de Vries 1961: s.v. *røng*, Magnússon 1989: s.v. *røng*, Thier 2002: 78 and 153, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*wranzō*; cf. above, 2.1). Thus, claims in favour of the Norse origin of the term can only rely on the general influence of Norse nautical terminology on Old English (see above, 3.4.2.5) and the late attestation of the term: as far as the *OEC* is concerned, it is only recorded as a gloss for *L cavernamen* (cp. *L caverna* 'cavern; hold of a ship') in HIGl (Oliphant) C582 = AntGl 6 (Kindschi) 517, two late Old English glossaries (see above, II.169 and II.6, respectively).<sup>50</sup> When these two factors are assessed against the dialectal distribution of the term in Old and Middle English texts and the existence

<sup>48</sup> On zero-derivation in Old English, see also Kastovsky 1985: 246–47 and Kastovsky 1990.

<sup>49</sup> HomU 34 (Nap 42) does record some likely Norse-derived loan-words (viz. OE *lagu* in HomU 34 (Nap 42) 90 and 94, and the names of the deities *Þórr* and *Óðinn* in HomU 34 (Nap 42) 149), but their use can be easily explained as a result of the popularization of these terms thanks to the Ælfrician and Wulfstanian texts (see above, 3.4.2.2.A and III.1.11.D).

<sup>50</sup> On the probable meaning of the uncommon *L cavernamen*, see Thier 2002: 78.

of the Middle Low German cognate, they do not seem to be strong enough to grant the presence of the term in the main body of this work.

### *III.5. Conclusion*

As the individual explanations indicate, there is a very significant disparity in the reliability of the evidence that is brought forward in favour of the Norse derivation of the terms analysed in this appendix. While in some cases rejecting the Norse origin of the term is fairly unproblematic (e.g. OE *folcstede* and *wælcyrige*; see above, III.4.T and III.4.ZZZ), on many other occasions decisions are not as easily made because the evidence that we have does not differ significantly from that available for some of the terms discussed in Chapter 2 (e.g. OE *afublic* and *hundrað*; see above, III.3.2.A and III.1.8.C). That is the reason why each term has to be assessed on its own merits. Admittedly, though, there may be terms that are actually from Old Norse which have been discussed in this section, just as there may be native terms included in the main body of the study. The uncertainty surrounding the actual etymology of many terms discussed in this study is precisely one of the main problems it faces (see above, 1.6.2.2).

## TERMS IN EARLY MIDDLE ENGLISH TEXTS INCLUDED IN THE *OEC*

### *IV.1. Texts Included in this Appendix*

‘To try to define the point of succession between successive periods of a language, such as Old and Middle English, is rather like trying to distinguish where night succeeds day. No-one will deny that for practical purposes they *are* different; but there is no natural demarcation.’ These are the opening lines of Kitson’s article on the period of transition from Old to Middle English (Kitson 1990). His comment summarizes the problems facing anyone who wants to distinguish between the Old and the early Middle English texts included in the *OEC*. Many texts belong to the transition between the two periods and their categorization is therefore very problematic, not least because extant manuscripts make it clear that such distinction had no relevance in the twelfth century (on this period, see further Irvine 2000, Treharne 2001, Cannon 2005, Swan 2006, Treharne 2006a, and Treharne 2006b). However, it is important to establish some limits to the present study. So as to facilitate the process of decision-making, categorization in this work relies in the main on the presence or absence of the text in Laing’s catalogue of the sources for the study of early Middle English (Laing 1993). The catalogue has to be taken with some caveats in mind, though, because it focuses on the date of the manuscripts, not the date of the texts themselves. Thus, for instance, Laing (Laing 1993: 23) includes in her book Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, MS 303, recording, amongst

other texts, the *Lives of St Giles* and *St Nicholas*. This inclusion is in keeping with the fact that the manuscript should be dated *c.* 1150 (see above, II.226). However, the predominantly Old English character of the texts, reflected in the fact that they maintain standard Old English inflections (Treharne 1997: 69), suggests that the study of any possibly Norse-derived terms in these texts should rather be included in the main body of this study.<sup>1</sup>

The texts dealt with in this appendix are arranged alphabetically according to the manuscript where they are recorded.

#### **IV.1.1. Cambridge, Trinity College, MS 987 (+ Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS fonds latin 8846): Eadwine's Canterbury Psalter (= PsGLE (Harsley))**

Pulsiano summarizes the characteristics of the gloss added to the so-called *Eadwine's Psalter* around the mid-twelfth century as follows: 'The Old English gloss participates in this union of backward glance and more-up-to-date regard in its combination of old and newer features, of various strata of glossing reaching back centuries alongside certain elements that show modernisation of the gloss [...] into early Middle English' (Pulsiano 2000: 193; cp. O'Neill 1992: 124, 130, and 132–33, and Laing 1993: 39). The use of *lagu* in PsGLE (Harsley) 77.1 could also be associated with such early Middle English features. The Norse-derived term is only recorded in a similar context in the late twelfth-century gloss to Paris, Bibliothèque nationale, MS fonds latin 8846 (= OccGl 50.2 (Hargreaves-Clark)), which is closely associated with (and possibly derivative from) the gloss to *Eadwine's Psalter* (see Hargreaves and Clark 1965). Needless to say, the term could have entered the glossatorial tradition earlier than the extant attestations;<sup>2</sup> however, given the uncertainty surrounding the term, it seems better to include its use in this appendix (see also Dance, forthcoming a).

<sup>1</sup> The use of *eorl* in Ch Steph (PRO1912 2) and Ch IIHen (PRO1912 3) could also be included here; however, given their dependence on Ch 1089 (Harm 34), they have been included in the main body of the text (see above, II.15.2.6). Similarly, some of the spurious documents attributed to Edward the Confessor and William the Conqueror could also be associated with the twelfth century; they are, however, included in the main body of the text (see above, II.15.2 and II.17.2).

<sup>2</sup> Indeed, the use of OE *lagu* to render L *lex* 'law' was a well-established practice in eleventh-century Canterbury (see above, 3.4.2.2.A).

**IV.1.2 Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 (+ London, British Library, MS Add. 14847): Ch 1483 (Whitelock 2) (+ ME *bōthe* in Ch 1519 (Whitelock 36), Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31), and Ch 1537 (Whitelock 27)) and Ch 1526 (Whitelock 1)**

These registers, also known as the *Sacrist's Register* and the *Registrum Album*, respectively, are likely to derive from the same source (see Lowe 2004). They record a number of pre-Conquest texts associated with the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds, Suffolk. Laing describes the language of the texts as 'modified OE' and explains that the forms that have been changed from the original documents 'probably represent E Anglian language at a mid or latish C13 stage rather than *ca.* 1300' (Laing 1993: 44 and 60; cp. Lowe 1990: 78–104). The texts have been modified in terms of both spelling (see below, note 10 in this appendix) and vocabulary. It is therefore somewhat problematic to decide how best to interpret the Norse-derived terms recorded in the texts included in these manuscripts (Ch 1076 (Harm 16), Ch 1077 (Harm 17), Ch 1078 (Harm 18), Ch 1079 (Harm 19), Ch 1080 (Harm 20), Ch 1081 (Harm 21), Ch 1082 (Harm 22), Ch 1083 (Harm 23), Ch 1084 (Harm 24), Ch 1085 (Harm 25), Ch 1468 (Rob 97), Ch 1483 (Whitelock 2), Ch 1490 (Whitelock 28), Ch 1499 (Whitelock 35), Ch 1519 (Whitelock 34), Ch 1521 (Whitelock 29), Ch 1525 (Whitelock 37–38), Ch 1526 (Whitelock 1), Ch 1527 (Whitelock 24), Ch 1529 (Whitelock 36), Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) and Ch 1537 (Whitelock 27); see above, II.15.1.10–18, II.15.2.5, II.137, II.147, II.149, II.150–54, II.156, II.158), i.e. whether to associate them with the date of the original texts or with the later Middle English copies. Given that most of the Norse-derived terms are generally in keeping with what is expected from eleventh-century texts from a Scandinavianized area and that they include terms which do not seem to have survived into the Middle English period (e.g. OE *lysing*; see above, 3.4.2.6.A.2), they have been discussed in the main body of this study (see above, 3.3). However, it is difficult to take the same course of action for the various attestations of ME *bōthe*. Most notably, the term is recorded in Ch 1483 (Whitelock 2), a will which Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 104) dates to 946 x 951. This grammatical form is the only Norse-derived term in the text, which is a fairly surprising lexical distribution, and from that perspective, it seems more appropriate to discuss that record in this appendix (cp. ME *mark* in Ch 1526 (Whitelock 1), on which see below, IV.2.1.K). Since all the attestations of the particle in the other Bury documents appear in the same structure (preposition + anaphoric personal pronoun + particle + *day* / *soul*), they are treated here as well, although we cannot rule out the possibility that they might be original rather than a mannerism of a later reviser.

#### **IV.1.3. Carlisle, Cumbria Record Office, D/Lons/L Medieval deeds C1: Gospatric's will (= Ch 1243 (Harm 121))**

Even though the text is likely to go back to an eleventh-century original, the only extant version of the will of Gospatric, lord of Allerdale and Dalston in Cumberland, is recorded in this thirteenth-century copy (see Harmer 1989: 419–23 and 531, and Laing 1993: 50). It is, therefore, likely that some of the Norse-derived terms recorded in the text go back to the Old English original. However, some parts of the text seem to have undergone changes during the process of transmission; accordingly, for the sake of simplicity, the Norse-derived terms recorded in them are included here instead of the main body of the text. See Harmer 1989: 422 on the presence of Northumbrian forms in Ch 1243 (Harm 121).

#### **IV.1.4. Durham, Prior's Kitchen, Cartularium Vetus: Ch Ranulf (Liebermann)**

This thirteenth-century manuscript records a writ of Ranulf Flambard, bishop of Durham (1099–1128), granting lands near the mouth of the Tweed to St Cuthbert's Church. The language of the text is associated with that of the Middle English period by Liebermann (Liebermann 1903: 284), the editor of the text, because all the declensional vowels are reduced to <e> (cp. Laing 1993: 53). Liebermann explains that the text shows the characteristics of the West Saxon *Schriftsprache* together with clearly Northumbrian features.

#### **IV.1.5. Huntingdon, Cambs., County R.O., SM27/465 (Acc. 2244): Ch 1110 (Harm 62)**

This writ records two different transactions involving various abbeys in the Fenlands. Harmer (Harmer 1989: 252–56 and 478–79) explains that the extant version cannot represent an original document. She hypothesizes that the fusion of various documents and the shaping into the extant form of the document is likely to have taken place 'in the Anglo-Norman period' (Harmer 1989: 256). Yet, given that the earliest attestations of the document belong to the fourteenth century, there is no way of knowing exactly when in 'the Anglo-Norman period' this would have happened. The manuscript is not included in Laing 1993, but Allen (Allen 1997a: 7) associates the linguistic usage of the text with that of the Final Continuation of the Peterborough Chronicle. Given this and the general uncertainty about the date of composition of the text as it stands, the text is discussed in this appendix.

**IV.1.6. London, British Library, MS Cotton Claudius D.iii: Winteneý Version of the Benedictine Rule (= BenRW)**

This thirteenth-century manuscript records a female version of the Rule of St Benedict which may have been prepared at some point during the eleventh or the twelfth century and which has been associated with the Cistercian women's monastery of Winteneý in Hampshire (see Gretsch 1978, Laing 1993: 72–73, and Henderson 1995). The language of the text can be associated with the South-West of England (see the *MED* and Gretsch 1978: 338–46).

**IV.1.7. London, British Library, MS Cotton Domitian ix: H-text of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle (= ChronH (Plummer))**

This version of the *Chronicle* has entries only for 1113 and 1114, which are independent from the E-text of the *Chronicle* (see Plummer 1892–99: II, §29). Even though the language is fairly conservative, Laing (Laing 1993: 75) includes the text amongst the sources for the study of early Middle English and that is the reason for the inclusion here of the Norse-derived terms recorded in this version.

**IV.1.8. London, British Library, MS Cotton Faustina A.iii: Ch 1122 (Harm 78) and Ch 1123 (Harm 79)**

Ch 1122 (Harm 78), which purports to date from 1045 x 1049, and Ch 1123 (Harm 79), supposedly from 1049, are only recorded in this thirteenth-century manuscript and in London, Westminster Abbey, Muniment Bk 11, a manuscript from the fourteenth century. Harmer (Harmer 1989: 313–16) sees these texts as having dubious authenticity and hence being later fabrications; her doubts are commonly shared by charter specialists (see the *Electronic Sawyer*, nos 1122 and 1123; cp. Denison 1985: 43). Thus, it may be better to associate these texts with the early Middle English rather than the late Old English period (cp. Laing 1993: 75–76).

**IV.1.9. London, British Library, MS Cotton Galba E.ii: Ch 1055 (Conway Davies)**

This thirteenth-century manuscript has one of the copies of Ch 1055 (Conway Davies), which purports to be a document from King Edward to the church of St Benedict (of Holme) in Norfolk. The document is, however, generally



believed to be spurious (see the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 1055). While the text is mainly in Latin, the concluding lines are in English (cp. Ch 984 (Kem 740)), with characteristics which associate it with the Middle rather than the Old English period (cp. Laing 1993: 76).

#### **IV.1.10. London, British Library, MS Cotton Roll ii.11: Rec 28.\* (Earle)**

This manuscript from the second half of the thirteenth century contains twenty-one documents, all associated with Crediton, Devon. Some documents are clearly copies of Anglo-Saxon texts: e.g. Rec 28.4 (Earle) is a (slightly altered) copy of the eleventh-century document Ch 1387 (Nap-Steven 4) (cp. Earle 1888: 423). As far as other documents are concerned, the existence of an Anglo-Saxon original is not as clear: Rec 28.1 (Earle) claims to be a declaration by Æthelgar, bishop of Crediton (934–53), of the indulgences which he had obtained for all the benefactors of Crediton minster. Earle (Earle 1888: 418 and 420–21) suggests that the document is a forgery because the first reliable document with indulgences as an endowment to a church dates from 1005, but he does not discount that the thirteenth-century text relies on an earlier original. Rec 28.3 (Earle), which purports to record an indulgence of Lifing, bishop of Crediton (1027–46), is described by Earle as ‘a mere false invention’ (Earle 1888: 420) because in the document Lifing appears to be leaving Crediton for Exeter, but there is no record of this having ever happened, and the see was not transferred until after his death. Morsbach (Morsbach 1929: 108–14) seems to believe that the texts do rely on Old English originals but acknowledges that the Middle English scribes introduced some changes to the original documents. He sees the changes as representing mainly phonological and morphological issues; from this perspective, the documents in this manuscript, which seem to exhibit Devonshire dialect, can be taken as examples of Middle English rather than Old English (cp. Laing 1993: 80, with references). The texts also seem to exhibit some lexical changes, though, and it is for this reason (as well as the unreliability of the texts) that their vocabulary is discussed in this appendix and not in the main body of this work.

#### **IV.1.11. London, British Library, MS Cotton Tiberius B.i: ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1066.69–78**

Ker (Ker 1990: no. 191) notes that the eight lines in fol. 164 of the manuscript, the final lines of the 1066-annal and hence of the C-text of the *Chronicle*, were

added in the second half of the twelfth century. This associates them with the early Middle English period rather than with the Old English period (cp. Laing 1993: 80, with references, and O'Brien O'Keeffe 2001: lxxii–lxxiv).

**IV.1.12. London, British Library, MS Cotton Vespasian B.xxiv + London, British Library, MS Harley 3763: Ch 1174 (Birch 117)**

Although Ch 1174 (Birch 117) purports to be an eighth-century grant of land by Æthelric, son of King Oshere, to St Mary's in Evesham, scholars agree that, at least as far as the Old English boundaries are concerned, the text is a forgery (see the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 1174). The date of the forgery cannot be established, but given that the text is only attested in the twelfth century, it might be better to associate its language with the early Middle English period rather than with the Old English period (see Laing 1993: 83 and 97).

**IV.1.13. London, British Library, MS Cotton Vespasian D.xiv: *Sermo in festis Sancti Marie uirginis* (= LS 22 (InFestisSMarie)), a vernacular version of the *Trinubium Annae* (= HomU 56 (Warn 43)), and a translation of part of the *Elucidarium sive Dialogus de summa totius christianiae theologiae* attributed to Honorius Augustodunensis (= Eluc 1 (Warn 45) and Eluc 2 (Warn 46))**

The *Sermo* and the *Elucidarium* translations are commonly identified as early Middle English texts recorded in a manuscript with southern (probably south-eastern, possibly Rochester or Canterbury) origin (see the *MED*, Hofstetter 1987: 240, Kitson 1990: 43 n. 116, Laing 1993: 83, with references, Hahn 1999: 82–83, and Allen 2000: 7; cf. Hollis and Wright 1992: 77, Treharne 2000: 31–34, and Irvine 2000: 48–54). The *Sermo* is a twelfth-century translation of a Latin work by Ralph d'Escures, bishop of Rochester (1108–14) and archbishop of Canterbury (1114–22; see Förster 1920: 58–60, Förster 1925b: 56 and 62, Förster 1932a, and Treharne 2006b). It may have been translated by someone from an area in or near the Danelaw, an 'Ostsachsen' ('East-Saxon') (see Förster 1925b: 60–61, Förster 1932a: 45–46, and Hofstetter 1987: 239–40).

Honorius Augustodunensis is likely to have composed his *Elucidarium*, possibly in Canterbury, during the final years of the eleventh century or the beginning of the twelfth century, probably sometime between 1092 and 1106 (see Förster 1901: 101, Handley 1984: 244 n. 8, and Flint 1995: 101).<sup>3</sup> The

<sup>3</sup> Förster, however, explains that the possibility that the English translator worked before

manuscript has two fragments of the English translation (viz. Eluc 1 (Warn 45) and Eluc 2 (Warn 46)). The first fragment, like the *Sermo*, seems to have been copied by the main hand of the manuscript, about whom Handley says that s/he ‘tended to be innovative in the field of vocabulary but conservative in the fields of phonology and morphology’ (Handley 1984: 247; cp. Handley 1985: 60–76). Handley suggests that the two fragments may have been translated by the same person because ‘the methods of translation [...] do not differ sufficiently to allow inference that new scribes were also new authors’ (Handley 1985: 329).

The translation of the *Trinubium Annae*, a key work in the development of the Marian cult, has received much less attention than the *Sermo*, to which it is appended in the manuscript (see, however, Förster 1925a: 115–17, Förster 1925b, and T. Hall 2002). Its date of composition remains unclear, its outer limits being dictated by the date of the manuscript and the fact that the text is likely to be based on a Latin version of the *Trinubium* very close to that copied in Cambridge, St John’s College, MS 35 in late eleventh-century or early twelfth-century Bury St Edmunds (see T. Hall 2002). Given that the text can be considered to be near-contemporary with the translation of the *Sermo*, and for the sake of consistency, it is also included in this appendix. As with the other texts in the manuscript, the original place of composition remains unclear, although Hall (T. Hall 2002: 135) suggests that it may have taken place in the same house the manuscript originates from.

#### IV.1.14. London, British Library, MS Cotton Vitellius E.xv: Ch 909 (Kem 709)

Ch 909 (Kem 709) presents itself as a charter by King Æthelred to St Frideswide’s Abbey in Oxfordshire and, from that perspective, could be associated with the texts discussed in II.13. However, given that this is the only Æthelredian text which possibly records the Norse-derived prepositions *fra* / *fro* and *til*, that in this case we cannot really talk about the maintenance of a particular technolact associated with the secretariat of the king, that the text is only recorded in Middle English and later manuscripts, and that there seems to be some agreement amongst scholars about its spurious character (see the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 909), it seems more appropriate to associate the presence of the preposition with the early Middle English period (see Laing 1993: 85).

Honorius compiled his work by relying on the source followed by the latter cannot be fully rejected (Förster 1901: 89).

**IV.1.15. London, British Library, MS Harley 61: Ch 630 (Birch 970)**

Ch 630 (Birch 970), which purports to record a grant by King Eadwig to the minster at Shaftesbury, Dorset, is only recorded in this fifteenth-century manuscript. Given that there exists some suspicion about its authenticity and that its language has clearly been modernized (see Kelly 1996: 86–92), it is appropriate to include the study of this charter here rather than in the main body of this study (cp. Laing 1993: 87)

**IV.1.16. London, British Library, MS Royal 1 A.xiv + Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 38: West Saxon Gospels**

The text of the West Saxon Gospels in this twelfth-century manuscript is likely to be a copy of that in Oxford, British Library, MS Bodley 441 (see above, II.258); in its turn, the text of the gospels in the Royal manuscript has been copied into the late twelfth- or early thirteenth-century manuscript Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 38 (Ker 1990: nos 245 and 325). The text in the Royal manuscript exhibits some Kentish forms, which suggests an origin in Canterbury (see Ker 1990: no. 245). Despite being a copy of an Old English text, the linguistic forms of the gospels as copied in the Royal and Hatton manuscripts should be associated with the early Middle English period (see Laing 1993: 99 and 133, with references).

**IV.1.17. London, British Library, MS Stowe 944: Ch 1428 (Harm 113)**

Even though this document purports to be an eleventh-century letter by a monk of New Minster, Winchester, to his bishop, Harmer (Harmer 1989: 387–95) argues that the text is likely to be a fabrication from the late twelfth century (cp. Laing 1993: 107).

**IV.1.18. London, Public Record Office, DL 41/6/1: Ch 457 (Birch 647)**

This manuscript records a copy of Ch 457 (Birch 647), a rhyming version of S 456, which purports to be a writ of King Æthelstan to the church and chapter at Ripon. S 456 is generally considered to be a spurious document (see the *Electronic Sawyer*, no. 456) and the presence of various French loan-words in Ch 457 (Birch 647) (e.g. ME *pēs*, *dēvōcioun*, *seint*) suggests that the text should

be assigned to the Middle English period. Fowler dates the text to 'the latter part of the thirteenth century, if not later' (Fowler 1882: 89 n. 1), while Laing attributes it to the fourteenth century (Laing 1993: 117).

**IV.1.19. Longleat, Marques of Bath's private collection, MS 29: Ch IIHen (Hearne)**

This fourteenth-century manuscript records the so-called Glastonbury Chartulary. One of the texts included in the manuscript is a document attributed to Henry II, who is said to have decided to restore the church of Glastonbury after it was destroyed by a fire (see Watkin 1947–56: no. 302, and Laing 1993: 151). Watkin (Watkin 1947–56: I, lxxii n. 1, and I, lxxiii n. 2) explains that the document cannot be dated because the list of witnesses presents an impossible assemblage. In any case, given that Henry II became king in 1154, the document, whether representing an authentic royal confirmation or a later fabrication, should be included in this appendix rather than the main body of the study.

**IV.1.20. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343: Versions of Old English sermons, including various by Ælfric and Wulfstan (e.g. ÆHomM 2 (Irv 3), ÆHomM 7 (Irv 2), HomU 1 (Irv 5), HomU 2 (Irv 6), and HomU 3 (Irv 7); see also below), as well as the so-called *History of the Holy Rood Tree* (= LS 5 (InventCrossNap)), an anonymous homily on the Nativity of the Virgin Mary (= LS 18.1 (NatMaryAss 10N)) and a poem known as *The Grave* (= Grave)**

Kitson (Kitson 1990) and Irvine (Irvine 1993: lv) assign the texts in this manuscript, which dates from the second half of the twelfth century and was probably written in Worcester or somewhere nearby (see Ker 1990: no. 320, and Irvine 2000: 55–61),<sup>4</sup> to the period of transition between Old and Middle English.<sup>5</sup> Some of the texts clearly rely on Old English texts, but the thorough

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Pope, who would attribute the manuscript to a southern house and assume that it was later sent to a library in the West Midlands (Pope 1967–68: 18).

<sup>5</sup> Cp. Heningham, who agrees with Dudley that *The Grave* is one of the sources of the so-called *Worcester Fragments* (on which see below, IV.1.24) and who does not rule out that it may have been composed before the Norman Conquest (Heningham 1940: 304–05; Dudley 1914: 6–8); Woolf (Woolf 1968: 83), who claims that it 'has a cleverness, which is neither typically Anglo-Saxon nor typically medieval'; Moffat 1984, who discusses the poem as part of the

study on those texts undertaken by Kitson (Kitson 1990) shows that they represent ‘scribal “translation”’ rather than mere copying (cp. A. Fischer 1996: 32–33, and Dance forthcoming a). This is particularly clear in the final part of the manuscript including *ÆHomM* 1 (Belf 9), *ÆHomM* 11 (Ass 4), *HomU* 3 (Irv 7), and *HomU* 4 (Belf 13) (see Kitson 1990: 29, cp. Kitson 1997b: 224–25), but, as mentioned below, IV.2.4.B, the same seems to be true as well for the so-called *History of the Holy Rood Tree*. Similarly, while the copy of the homily on the Nativity of the Virgin Mary recorded in the eleventh-century manuscript from Worcester Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 114 (viz. LS 18.2 (NatMaryAss 10J); Ker 1990: no. 331) only records examples of OE *æ*, the copy in this manuscript includes reflexes of both OE *æ* and *lagu* (see A. Fischer 1989: 112, and Dance forthcoming a). Given the lexical changes which the manuscript exhibits, the loan-words recorded in the texts in this manuscript are dealt with here rather than as part of the main body of the monograph (cp. Laing 1993: 125–26).

#### IV.1.21. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 730: CollGI 25

This manuscript from c. 1200 has some English, Latin, and Anglo-Norman glosses to Latin lemmata in the last three leaves. It was probably written at the Abbey of Buildwas in Shropshire (see Ker 1990: no. 317, and Laing 1993: 126–27).

#### IV.1.22. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Laud Misc. 639: Final Continuation of the *Peterborough Chronicle* (= ChronE (Irvine) \*)

The labelling of the language of the Peterborough Continuations is a matter of debate. On the one hand, Irvine (Irvine 2004: ciii) suggests that the annals of both the First (1122–31; see above, II.163.18) and the Final Continuation (1132–54) are written in ‘early Middle English, distinctively East Midland in dialect’. Her description agrees with Clark’s characterization of the Final Continuation as ‘incontrovertibly Middle English’ (C. Clark 1970: lii; cp. Skaffari 2002: 237) and her identification of Middle English trends in vocabulary and phonology in the First Continuation (C. Clark 1970: lxii; cp. Bennett

early Middle English literary tradition; Lerer 1997: 141, who suggests that the text is ‘slightly later’ than the *Ælfrician* compositions without suggesting how much later; and Dance 2003: 64 n. 113, who mentions the relationship between the *Worcester Fragments* and *The Grave* (cp. Moffat 1987: 41, and 56 nn. 43 and 44).

and Smithers 1968). On the other hand, Skaffari concludes that, on the basis of loan-words, the First Continuation is ‘on the boundary between Old and Middle English’ (Skaffari 2002: 244), albeit closer to the Old English annals. Similarly, Laing (Laing 1993: 139) only includes the Final Continuation amongst her sources for the study of early Middle English, and Laing and Lass (Laing and Lass 2006: 419) explain that this Continuation is the earliest text included in *A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English 1150–1325*. Accordingly, only the Final Continuation is discussed in this appendix.

The vocabulary of these annals is heavily influenced by Old Norse (for general studies, see C. Clark 1970: lxiii and lxix, Kniezsa 1994, and Mancho-Barés 1997, which relies on Kniezsa’s study).

#### **IV.1.23. Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Rawlinson G 57: Glosses to *Disticha Catonis* and *Ilias latina* (= OccGl\* (Först-Nap))**

These glosses should be assigned to the twelfth century (see Förster and Napier 1906, and Laing 1993: 141).

#### **IV.1.24. Worcester Cathedral, Dean and Chapter Library, MS F 174: Worcester Fragments (e.g. HomU 5.1–7 (Buch A–G))**

At least part of this manuscript was copied down by a scribe well known to Middle English scholars, viz. the so-called ‘tremulous hand of Worcester’, which helps to localize its production in Worcester and date it to the first half of the thirteenth century (see Laing 1993: 155, with references). The manuscript records the so-called *Worcester Fragments*, which include a lament on the decay of learning in England (= HomU 13 (Hall)), a text without Norse-derived terms and, more importantly for our purposes, an address of the soul to the body (= HomU 5.1–7 (Buch A–G)).<sup>6</sup> Heningham argues that the fragments were composed by ‘a very early Middle English poet’ working ‘not very long after the Conquest’, who relied very heavily on the pre-Conquest tradition (Heningham 1940: 306; cp. Moffat 1987: 25, Blake 1992: 509, and Dance 2003: 63–65). Moffat (Moffat 1987: 25) suggests that the fragments were composed in a dialect not too different from that of the scribe, who ‘was neither a mirror copyist nor a wholesale “translator” of his exemplar’ (Moffat 1987: 21).

<sup>6</sup> For an argument in favour of considering the lament and the address as one single text, see Johansen 1994.



#### IV.1.25. York, Borthwick Institute, *Magnum Registrum Album*: Ch Thomas (Liebermann)

This fourteenth-century manuscript contains, amongst other documents, a list of the powers and laws of Archbishop Thomas I of York (1070–1100). Liebermann (Liebermann 1903: 279) explains that, although the document could be dated to *c.* 1080, the linguistic features of the text point mainly to the thirteenth century (cp. Laing 1993: 156–57), according to which the Norse-derived terms it records are discussed in this section instead of the main body of the study. Interestingly, the *DOE* does not seem to record all the terms attested in this text: e.g. while it records *fiscōp* ‘fish-trade’, it does not refer to *cōpfare* ‘merchandise’.

#### IV.2. Norse-derived Terms in the Texts

The (possibly) Norse-derived terms only recorded in the texts mentioned in the previous section are not discussed in the main body of this study because, strictly speaking, they cannot be said to be recorded in Old English texts. The terms are included here instead so as to help users of the *OEC* and prevent them from further confusion. References to the appropriate sections are given for those terms with attestations in Old English texts. Terms are arranged according to the same broad categories as in Chapter 2.

##### IV.2.1. Phonological Evidence

###### (A) ME *brinie* (OE *brynige*)

Attestations: ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1066.74,<sup>7</sup> ChronE (Irvine) 1137.23

Discussion: see above, 2.2.2.4.A. Onions (Onions 1908–09: 505–06) suggests that the scribe of the final part of the C-text may have had French rather than English as his mother tongue, according to which <brunie> in ChronC (O’Brien O’Keeffe) 1066.74 may actually represent OFr. *bruine* ‘corselet’, itself a Norse-derived term.

<sup>7</sup> These occurrences should be associated with the use of the term in VspAHom 243.23. This context, belonging to a homily recorded in London, British Library, MS Cotton Vespasian A.xxii and edited by Morris (R. Morris 1868: 241–43), is not included in the *OEC*, but it is quoted by the *DOE*: s.v. *brynige*. On the early Middle English character of this homily, see Laing 1993: 82–83, with references.

**(B)** ME *brennen* ‘to burn’

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1137.37 and 1137.45

Discussion: Old English texts record the metathetic form *bernan* ‘to cause to burn, kindle, burn, consume’. Thus, ME *brennen*, first attested in the Final Continuation to the E-text of the *Chronicle*, is commonly considered to be Norse-derived (cp. OIc *brenna* ‘to burn, destroy by fire’; see Björkman 1900–02: 182, Mezger 1933: 1037–38, Serjeantson 1935: 75, the *MED*: s.v. *brennen*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *brenna*, Jordan 1974: §165, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *burn*, v.<sup>1</sup>). However, given the relationship between ME *brennen* and *rennen* and associated verbs (see Mezger 1933), the forms of this verb may have developed by analogy with those of ME *rennen* (on which see above, 2.2.2.4.B). Influence of non-metathetic OE *bryne* ‘burning, fire’ cannot be discounted either.

**(C)** ME *carlman* (OE *carlmann*)

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1137.17

Discussion: see above, 2.2.1.8.B.

**(D)** ME *coup* (cp. OE *cōp*) word-field

Discussion: see above, 2.2.1.2.B.

**(D.1)** ME *coupen* ‘to buy, conduct trading’

Attestations: Ch Thomas (Liebermann) 6

**(D.2)** ME *coupfäre* ‘merchandise’

Attestations: Ch Thomas (Liebermann) 4

**(D.3)** ME *coupman* ‘tradesman’

Attestations: Ch Thomas (Liebermann) 6

**(D.4)** ME *fiskcoup* / *fishcoup* ‘sale of fish’:

Attestations: Ch Thomas (Liebermann) 3<sup>8</sup>

**(E)** OE *formælan* (?) ‘to transfer (by mutual agreement)’<sup>9</sup>

Attestation: Ch Thomas (Liebermann) 8

Discussion: This is the only attestation of the verb, which is likely to be a new formation on the basis of OE *formāl(a)* / *-mæl* (see above, 2.2.1.7.A.1).

<sup>8</sup> IV.2.1.D.2–4 are not recorded in the *MED*.

<sup>9</sup> The *MED* does not record the Middle English reflex of this verb.

**(F)** ME *fra* / *fro* (OE *fra* / *fro*)

Attestations: Ch Thomas (Liebermann) 2 (?), Ch 909 (Kem 709) 1, Ch 909 (Kem 709) 8, Ch 909 (Kem 709) 9 (2x), Ch 909 (Kem 709) 10, Ch 909 (Kem 709) 12, Ch 909 (Kem 709) 13 (2x), Ch 909 (Kem 709) 14, Ch 909 (Kem 709) 17, Ch 909 (Kem 709) 20, Ch 909 (Kem 709) 21, Ch 909 (Kem 709) 23 (2x), Ch 909 (Kem 709) 24 (2x), Ch 909 (Kem 709) 27 (2x), Ch 909 (Kem 709) 28, Ch 909 (Kem 709) 29, Ch 1174 (Birch 117) 2, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.48, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.59

Discussion: see above, 2.2.2.6; on the presence of the Norse-derived preposition in the West Midlands during the early Middle English period, see Dance 2003: 353.

**(G)** ME *gersume* (OE *gersum(a)*)

Attestations: HomU 5.3 (Buch C) 12, HomU 5.7 (Buch G) 13, HomU 5.7 (Buch G) 16

Discussion: see above, 2.2.2.1.C.

**(H)** ME *kirke* ‘church’

Attestations: Ch 457 (Birch 647) 7, Ch 457 (Birch 647) 9, Ch 457 (Birch 647) 11, Ch 1055 (Conway Davies) 4<sup>10</sup>

Discussion: The presence of [k] instead of the expected [ʃ] (cp. OE *cyrice*; see above, 2.2.2.1) suggests that the term should be associated either with its Norse-influenced pronunciation, in which case the term is not really a loan-word (cp. Bibire 2001: 100), or with the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *kirkja* ‘church’, itself a loan-word from Old English or Old Saxon (see Thors 1957: 20–23, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *kirkja*, *kyrkja*; on the presence of the Norse-derived loan-word in the British Isles, see further Fellows-Jensen 1987).

**(I)** ME *lāh* ‘low’

Attestations: Grave 8 and 9

<sup>10</sup> To this list we should add the attestations of the term in Ch 1483 (Whitelock 2), Ch 1516 (Whitelock 33), Ch 1525 (Whitelock 37–38), Ch 1526 (Whitelock 1), Ch 1527 (Whitelock 24), and Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31), as well as Ch 1076 (Harm 16) 3 and Ch 1077 (Harm 17) 3, where it appears in the place-name *Kirkeby* (Kirby). These documents are recorded in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 and London, British Library, MS Add. 14847, on which see above, IV.1.2. McIntosh (McIntosh 1976: 41–42) attributes the use of forms with [k] instead of [ʃ] in this word, as well as in other terms like ‘ilk’ (‘each’), ‘ik’ (‘I’), or ‘swilk’ (‘such’), to thirteenth-century East Anglian rather than to the original Old English documents (cp. Fellows-Jensen 1987: 295–96).

Discussion: The adjective is most likely a loan-word based on the Viking Age Norse adjective represented by OIc *lágr* 'low, short' < PGmc \**lēzaz* (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 90, the *MED*: s.v. *loue*, adj., de Vries 1961: s.v. *lágr*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *low*, a. and n., and Dance 2003: 363). If the term represented a native reflex of the Proto-Germanic adjective, OE /æ:/ > ME /ɛ:/ or /e:/ > /e:/ would have been expected instead of ME /a:/ (see above, 2.2.1.4).

(J) ME *lite* 'colour, dye'

Attestations: Eluc 1 (Warn 45) 24

Discussion: OIc *litr* 'color, hue', which exhibits the common North Germanic loss of the semivowel in front of /l/ (see above, 2.2.2.5), is cognate with OE *wlite* 'brightness, appearance, beauty' (< PGmc \**wlitiz*). The lack of the semivowel and the meaning of ME *lite* in the translation of the *Elucidarium* point towards its Norse-derivation (see Björkman 1900–02: 178, Serjeantson 1935: 70, Thorson 1936: 36, the *MED*: s.v. *lite*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *litr*, Peters 1981: 97, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *lit*, n.). It is noteworthy, however, that Eluc 1 (Warn 45) 23 records 'litigere' 'one who beautifies, painter', which the *MED* (s.v. *litigere*) associates with ME *wlitī* < OE *wlitig* 'radiant, beautiful', and OE *wlitigian* 'to beautify, adorn'. This would seem to render Björkman's statement that 'in the text in which the word *lit* occurs, *wl-* is preserved in native words' (Björkman 1900–02: 178) not fully accurate (but note 'wlite' in Eluc 2 (Warn 46) 6). The loss of the semivowel in 'litigere' casts some element of doubt onto the reliability of its absence from ME *lite* as a sign of Norse derivation. Förster may have been thinking along these lines when he claimed a 'total absence of any Scandinavian and French element' in this text (Förster 1901: 89), although his comment refers specifically to the other fragment from the *Elucidarium* (viz. Eluc 2 (Warn 46)).

(K) ME *mark* (OE *marc*)

Attestations: Ch 1526 (Whitelock 1) 7, Ch 1526 (Whitelock 1) 12, Ch 1526 (Whitelock 1) 42, Rec 28.4 (Earle) 2

Discussion: On the Norse-derived character of the term, see above, 2.2.1.8.C. Whitelock (Whitelock 1930: 100) explains that the thirteen-century copy of Ch 1526 (Whitelock 1) in Cambridge, University Library, MS Ff.2.33 (see above, IV.1.2) has replaced *mancus* in the original document, which she assigns to 942 x 951 (Whitelock 1930: 99), with *marc*. This is the same replacement which can be seen in Rec 28.4 (Earle) when it is compared with its eleventh-century version (viz. Ch 1387 (Nap-Steven 4) 3). These lexical updates are in keeping with the replacement of the *mancus* by the *mark* as the English weight

for gold (see Morsbach 1929: 135, n. for ll. 1–2 in his document IV, and above, 3.4.2.4.A).

**(L)** ME *rōte* (OE *rōt*)

Attestations: HomU 4 (Belf 13) 4 and 5 (cf. OE *wyrtruma* in ÆCHom II, 30 238.109 and 238.110), LS 5 (InventCrossNap) 49

Discussion: see above, 2.2.2.5.

**(M)** ME *saughte* (OE *saht* ?) word-field

Discussion: see above, 2.2.1.5.B.<sup>11</sup>

**(M.1)** ME *saught* (adj.) (OE *saht*)

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1135.22 (?)

**(M.2)** ME *saughte* (n.) (OE *saht*)

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1140.64 and 1140.66 (?)

**(M.3)** ME *saughtelen* (OE *sahtlian*)

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1140.32, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.34, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.43 (?), OccGl 72 (Först-Nap) 1

**(M.4)** ME *wrongsaught* ‘in disharmony, discord’

Attestations: BenRW 4.25.24

Discussion: On the etymology of the first lexeme of the compound, see above, III.4.FFFF. With regard to the compound itself, cp. OIc *rangsátrr* ‘disagreeing, at variance’ (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *wrong-saught*).

**(N)** ME *skēre* (OE *scēr*)

Attestations: Ch 1110 (Harm 62) 10, 12, and 18

Discussion: see above, 2.2.2.2.B.

**(O)** ME *scrēmen* ‘to scream’

Attestations: HomU 3 (Irv 7) 87

Discussion: Given the presence of /sk/ instead of /ʃ/ in the initial cluster and the late attestation of the term, this verb can be identified as a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. OIc *skrēma* ‘to scare away’, and *skramsa* ‘to scream’; see Björkman 1900–02: 131, A. Campbell 1972: s.v. *scrēman*, and the *MED*: s.v.

<sup>11</sup> On the presence of an interrogation mark after the attestations of the word-field with <æ> instead of <a>, see above, 2.2.1.5.B.

*scrēmen*). Hogg (Hogg 1992: §7.17.4) explains that the palatalization of the initial cluster in Old English seems to have taken place as well when it was followed by /r/; thus, we would have expected the native cognates of the Norse terms to be pronounced with /ʃ/ (cp. the verbs PDE *shrape* and *scrape*, which can be considered to be Norse-derived, although its Norse derivation is not accepted by all scholars; see the *OED* 1989: s.v. *scrape*, v., and Dance 2003: 435–36). English texts do attest a variant of PDE *scream* with the initial palatalized sound, but it is very rare and mainly attested during the early Modern English period (see the *OED* 1989: s.v. *shream*). This may indicate that it represents the result of an analogical development rather than a reflex of a native Old English verb. Notably, though, the Norse derivation of the term is not always accepted (see the *OED* 1989: s.v. *scream*, and Orel 2003: s.v. *\*skrekjanan*), and, indeed, it might be the case that the spelling <scræmeð> in the homily represents /ʃ/ rather than /sk/ (see Irvine 1993: lv and lix), which would increase the possibility of the existence of a native Old English verb.

(P) ME *though* / *þoh* ‘although’

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1135.21, 1135.22, 1137.57, and 1140.62

Discussion: While in ChronE (Irvine) 1135.22 the term acts as a conjunction, in all the other attestations we encounter it as part of a complex adverb with OE *hwæðere* as the second component (cp. OE *ðeahhwæðere* ‘however, nevertheless’). The presence of /o:/ (e.g. *þohuuethere* in ChronE (Irvine) 1135.21) instead of the expected /æ:a/ > /æ:/ (> /ɛ:/) suggests that the adverb is Norse-derived (cp. OIc *þó* < *\*þauþ*, with lowering of the diphthong in front of /x/; see Noreen 1923: §98.2 and above, 2.2.1.2; see Björkman 1900–02: 73–74, the *MED*: s.vv. *though*, adv. and *though*, conj., de Vries 1961: s.v. *þó*, C. Clark 1970: lxix, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *though*, and Kniezsa 1994: 241). The presence of the final velar consonant can be explained as a result of analogy with the native form or by postulating an intermediate Viking Age Norse form *\*þóh* (see Björkman 1900–02: 181). In the 1137- and 1140-annal the first component of the complex adverb is rather attested as *þopþ*, a form which Einarsson would like to explain by association with OIc *þópóru* < *þó at hváru* ‘yet in either case’ (Einarsson 1938: 18–20). As he points out, it may be that the simplex form *þopþ* in ChronE (Irvine) 1135.22 developed as a back-formation from the complex adverbial form.

**(Q) ME *um* ‘around’<sup>12</sup>**

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1137.35

Discussion: While OE *ymb(e)* ‘about, around’ has an *i*-umlauted root, the lack of this process in the form attested in the *Peterborough Chronicle* suggests that the latter is likely to represent instead the Norse cognate (cp. OIc *um(b)* ‘around, about’ < PGmc \**umbi*; see Björkman 1900–02: 224, de Vries 1961: s.v. *um*, C. Clark 1970: lxix, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *umbe*, prep. and adv.).<sup>13</sup> In other Middle English texts, the presence of <u> cannot be taken as an indication of Norse-derivation, for this is the common spelling for the reflex of the Old English *i*-umlauted vowel in the West Midlands until c. 1300. Yet, had the Peterborough form had an *i*-umlauted vowel, we would have expected it to be spelt with either <y> or <i>, a spelling which is already attested in the Peterborough Interpolations and Continuations and which shows the common unrounding in Middle English of the Old English vowel (both long and short) in the North and North-East midlands (see Jordan 1974: §§39–42, and Irvine 2004: cxiii and cxxii).

**IV.2.2. Morphological Evidence****(A) ME *at* as marker of infinitive**

Attestation: Ch 457 (Birch 647) 20

Discussion: The same text records the use of ME *at* as a conjunction (Ch 457 (Birch 647) 19, 21, 22, 25, and 28) and as a relative pronoun (Ch 457 (Birch 647) 19). The etymological interpretation of ME *at* in these cases is very difficult. On the one hand, it could be interpreted as a worn-down by-form of OE *ðæt* > ME *that* (see above, III.2.2.A), especially given that *at* is not very commonly used as a relative pronoun in Norse texts (see the *ONP*: s.v. *4at*, conj., sense B, and Faarlund (Faarlund 2004: 259–69). However, admittedly, the Norse particle with these functions may have been recorded in northern Middle English and early Scots texts (see Caldwell 1974: 31, and A. King 1997: 172), and the *DOE* (s.v. *at*, conj. and pron.) analyses these usages as Norse-derived. Thus, the etymology of ME *at* when used as a conjunction and a relative pronoun has to remain unclear, but that is not the case when the particle

<sup>12</sup> Cp. *MED*: s.v. *um*- pref.

<sup>13</sup> Noreen explains that *i*-umlaut in Old Norse does not take place in unstressed syllables preceding stressed syllables; therefore, we would not expect it to happen in proclitic *umb* (Noreen 1923: §64).



appears as a marker of infinitive, for OE *ðæt* / ME *that* was not used for this purpose. In this case, the Norse derivation of the particle seems more likely (cp. OIc *at* as an infinitive marker; see Faarlund 2004: 122, 137–38, 271–72; cp. Björkman 1900–02: 201, the *MED*: s.v. *that*, adv. with infin., the *DOE*: s.v. *at*, particle, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *a-*, prefix, sense 5).

**(B)** ME *bōn* ‘prayer’

Attestation: LS 18.1 (NatMaryAss 10N) 112

Discussion: This term most probably represents one of the common lexical alterations in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343 (see above, IV.1.20) because the thirteenth-century manuscript Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Hatton 114 has OE *gebed* ‘prayer’ in the same context (viz. LS 18.2 (NatMaryAss 10J) 113). Not surprisingly, the noun is commonly used in the South-West Midlands texts analysed by Dance 2003. The term is likely to be the reflex of the Norse cognate of OE *bēn* ‘prayer, request’ (cp. OIc *bæn* / *bōn* ‘request, prayer’). While the native noun represents an *i*-stem noun (< PGmc *\*bōniz*), the same cannot be easily said for the Old Norse noun because there seems to exist some dialectal variation: the Old East Norse form belongs to the same stem class as the native English noun, while in Old West Norse there are forms without *i*-umlaut, suggesting that they belong to a different stem class (see Björkman 1900–02: 205, Björkman 1901: 5, Noreen 1923: §392.3, the *MED*: s.v. *bōn*, n.2, de Vries 1961: s.v. *bæn*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *boon*, n.<sup>1</sup>, and Dance 2003: 343).

**(C)** ME *hengen* ‘to hang’

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1137.20 and 1137.21

Discussion: Old English had two related verbs meaning ‘to hang’: OE *hōn*, a strong verb (< PGmc *\*xanxanan*; pret. sing. *heng*, past part. *hangen*), and OE *hangian*, a weak verb (< PGmc *\*xanxēnan*). Old Norse had a cognate strong verb (cp. OIc *hanga* ‘to hang, be suspended’), while its weak verb was actually a causative verb formed on the basis of PGmc *\*xanxanan* and its by-form *\*xanzanan* (cp. OIc *hengja* ‘to hang up, suspend’ < PGmc *\*xanzianan*; see Orel 2003: s.vv. *\*xanzianan*, *\*xanxanan*, and *\*xanxēnan*, and Boutkan and Siebinga 2005: s.v. *hanzoch*). Even though other West Germanic languages attest cognates of the causative verb (cp. OFris. *hingia* ‘to cause to hang’, and OHG *hengen* ‘to allow, slacken the reins’), Old English does not, and this suggests that ‘hanged’ in the Peterborough Continuation may be a Norse-derived loan-word (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *hōngen*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *hang*, v., and Dance 2003: 406 n. 145).

**(D)** ME *lāne, lōne* ‘loan, that which is lent or owing’

Attestations: *ÆHomM* 7 (Irv 2) 11

Discussions: As in the case of ME *bōn*, this noun is likely to be one of the lexical substitutions carried out in Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343 (see above, IV.2.2.B). While it has a significant presence in early Middle English texts from the South-West Midlands (see Dance 2003: 365), it is not otherwise attested in the *Ælfrician* corpus, where OE *forgylðan* tends to collocate instead with OE *feoh*, as it does in other contexts in the same homily. The root vowel suggests that it is likely to be a reflex of the Viking Age Norse term represented by OIc *lán* instead of the native OE *læn*: the latter exhibits the effects of *i*-umlaut, as one would expect from an *i*-stem noun (< PGmc *\*laixwniz*), while this sound change did not take place in Old Norse, where the term is instead an *a*-stem noun (< PGmc *\*laixwnaz*; see Björkman 1900–02: 30 n. 1 and 108, the *MED*: s.v. *lōne*, n. 1, de Vries 1961: s.v. *lán*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *loan*, n. 1, and Dance 2003: 82).

**(E)** ME *leofand* ‘living’

Attestations: Ch 1243 (Harm 121) 13

Discussion: While the root of the verb seems to be the native *leof-*, a form of the Middle English reflex of OE *libban* ‘to live’, the present participle suffix probably represents the Norse form instead of the native *-end* (cp. OIc *-and*; cp. Liebermann 1903: 278, and Harmer 1989: 423). It is likely to be the case, however, that this form should be associated, not with the eleventh-century document, but with the thirteenth-century copy or some intermediary stage between the two because, as pointed out by Harmer, the passage where it appears ‘exhibits a number of remarkable features and, if it is ultimately derived from an Old English text, it has been greatly altered in transmission’ (Harmer 1989: 534 n. to l. 11) (cp. the corrupted form ‘bœnand’ in Ch 1243 (Harm 121) 7, which may represent OE *bufan* ‘above’, written <buuan>, then <bunan>, and then misunderstood as a present participle, as suggested by Harmer 1989: 533–34 n. to l. 6).

**(F)** ME *tāken* (OE *tacan*)

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1135.19, 1135.20, 1140.45, 1140.58, and 1140.60

Discussion: see above, 2.3.2.3.A. ‘toc to werrien’ (‘took to making war’) in the 1135-annal could be associated with OIc *taka at* + infinitive ‘to begin’ (see Olszewska 1933: 79, and Denison 1981: 291).

### IV.2.3. Close Association with the Scandinavian Newcomers and Settlers

#### IV.2.3.1. Reference to the Scandinavian newcomers and their world

##### (A) ME *ērl* (OE *eorl*) word-field

Discussion: see above, 2.4.1.B.

##### (A.1) ME *ērl* (OE *eorl*)

Attestations: Ch Thomas (Liebermann) 9, Ch 1110 (Harm 62) 1, Ch 1110 (Harm 62) 41, Ch 1243 (Harm 121) 12, ChronE (Irvine) 1138.3, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.1, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.8, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.11, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.13, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.22, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.29, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.32, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.33, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.34, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.42, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.48, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.58, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.60, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.68, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.69, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.72, ChronE (Irvine) 1154.3

##### (A.2) ME *ērlđōm* (OE *eorlđōm*)

Attestations: ChronH (Plummer) 1114.7

##### (B) ME *laue* (OE *lagu*) world-field

Discussion: see above, 2.4.1.E, and Dance forthcoming a.

##### (B.1) ME *laue* (OE *lagu*)

Attestations: ÆHomM 7 (Irv 2) 133, ÆHomM 7 (Irv 2) 144, ÆHomM 7 (Irv 2) 146, ÆHomM 7 (Irv 2) 153, BenRW 55.111.5, Ch 1428 (Harm 113) 28, Ch Thomas (Liebermann) 1, HomU 1 (Irv 5) 36, HomU 1 (Irv 5) 39, HomU 1 (Irv 5) 175, HomU 56 (Warn 43) 14, LS 18.1 (NatMaryAss 10N) 358, OccGl 50.2 (Hargreaves-Clark) 77.1 (= PsGlE (Harsley) 77.1)

##### (B.2) ME *outlaue* (OE *ūtlagian*)

Attestations: ÆHomM 2 (Irv 3) 62 and 65

#### IV.2.3.2. Dialectal distribution

##### (A) ME *bōthe* (OE *bāðe*)

Attestations: Ch 1483 (Whitelock 2) 47, Ch 1529 (Whitelock 36) 2, Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 11, Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 10, Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 38, Ch 1531 (Whitelock 31) 42, Ch 1537 (Whitelock 27) 6, ChronE (Irvine) 1137.17

Discussion: see above, 2.4.2.C and IV.1.2.

**(B)** ME *derf* (OE *dearf*)

Attestations: Ch 1110 (Harm 62) 26 (<deorf>), Ch 1243 (Harm 121) 11

Discussion: see above, 2.4.2.D.

**(C)** ME *dreng* (OE *dreng*)

Attestations: Ch Ranulf (Liebermann) 1, Ch 1243 (Harm 121) 1<sup>14</sup>

Discussion: see above, 2.4.2.E.

**(D)** ME *heining* ‘enclosure’

Attestations: Ch 1243 (Harm 121) 6

Discussion: Even though the term can be associated with OE *hegian* ‘to fence in, hedge, enclose’, the presence of the nasal before the suffix suggests that this consonant was part of the root of the verb this noun derives from. It is therefore more likely that, as suggested by Harmer (Harmer 1989: 533 n. to l. 6), this deverbal noun should be associated with the Old Norse cognate verb (cp. OIc *hegna* ‘to hedge, protect’; cp. the *MED*: s.v. *heining*, the *OED* 1989: s.vv. *hain*, n. and *hain*, v.<sup>1</sup>, and Dance 2003: 359). However, given that other West Germanic verbs have roots with the nasal (cp. MLG / MDu. *hegenen* ‘to surround with a hedge’, MHG *heinen* id.), the possibility that the term is a native derivation cannot be discounted (cp. Björkman 1900–02: 242, and above, 2.1). It is therefore the textual distribution of the term in Old English and later texts that seems to argue most strongly in favour of its Norse origin (cp. the *EDD*: s.v. *haining*, sb.).

**(E)** ME *hernes* ‘brains’

Attestation: ChronE (Irvine) 1137.23

Discussion: The late attestation of the term and its general association with Scandinavianized areas (see the *EDD*: s.v. *harn*, the *MED*: s.v. *hernes*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *harn*, n.<sup>1</sup>) suggest that this noun may be Norse-derived (cp. OIc *hjarni* ‘brain’) rather than a native reflex of PGmc *\*xer(z)nōn* (cp. OHG *hirni*, MLG *herne* ‘brain’; see Björkman 1900–02: 213, Serjeantson 1935: 75, the *MED*: s.v. *hernes*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *hjarni*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *harn*, n.<sup>1</sup>, Kniezsa 1994: 24, and Kries 2003: 93).

**(F)** ME *sāklēsse* (OE *saclēas*)

Attestations: BenRW 2.15.18, Ch 1110 (Harm 62) 10, Ch 1110 (Harm 62) 12, Ch 1110 (Harm 62) 18

Discussion: see above, 2.4.2.Q.

<sup>14</sup> On the meaning of ME *dreng* in these texts, see above, 3.4.2.3.B.

**(G)** ME *til* (OE *til*) ‘to, until’

Attestations: Ch 630 (Birch 970) 38, Ch 909 (Kem 709) 15, ChronE (Irvine) 1137.8, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.49

Discussion: OE *til* ‘to, until’ is recorded in the main in Old Northumbrian texts (CædN 5, RuneRuthwellA 3, and MtGl (Li) 26.17 and 26.31), although it is also attested in the metrical version the Old English psalms recorded in the Paris Psalter (PPs 116.2), which is commonly associated with the mid-tenth-century West Saxon dialect (see Hofstetter 1987: 537–38, where another possible example of Northumbrian influence on the text is discussed). Given the chronological gap between the Old and early Middle English attestations and that the earliest attestations of the preposition in early Middle English texts occur in the heavily Scandinavianized Final Continuation to the *Peterborough Chronicle*, it is commonly suggested that, while the Old English attestations are likely to represent a native preposition (OFris. *til* ‘until’, on which see Miedma 1972–73), the Middle English preposition might be fully or partially Norse-derived (cp. OIc *til* ‘to’; see Björkman 1900–02: 222, Serjeantson 1935: 75, de Vries 1961: s.v. *til*, the OED 1989: s.v. *till*, prep., conj., adv., Dance 2003: 378, and Kries 2003: 99). This view has recently been challenged by Krygier (Krygier 2011), who would admit the native derivation of the preposition as far as its earliest attestations are concerned, but not in connection with later attestations. However, his view is problematic because the verse psalms in the Paris Psalter do not otherwise show any Scandinavian influence (on their diction, see Diamond 1963, and Toswell 1990). Similarly, there is no need to consider Aldred’s preposition as Norse-derived. Krygier bases his argument in favour of Norse-derivation on the facts that Aldred’s use of the preposition does not fully coincide with that in its previous attestations, and that Aldred seems to have preferred OE *tō* in contexts similar to those where the preposition occurs in his glosses. However, given that the attestations of the preposition in early Northumbrian are so limited and that this is not the only case where Aldred did not follow his lexical preferences consistently (see above, 4.2.3 and 4.3.1), neither argument is particularly strong.

**(H)** ME *witnesman* ‘witness’<sup>15</sup>

Attestation: Ch 1243 (Harm 121) 19

Discussion: This term, which is only recorded in the above context as far as the OEC is concerned, appears together with ‘bode’ (probably a reflex of OE *boda* ‘messenger’) in a reference to a tenurial duty of providing a messenger and

<sup>15</sup> The term is not recorded in the MED.

a witness. Harmer (Harmer 1989: 535–36 n. to l. 19) explains that this formula is attested in thirteenth- and fourteenth-century documents associated with Lancashire, Westmorland, Cumberland, and Durham, and nowadays the use of term is mainly restricted to northern England and Scotland. It is only this dialectal distribution that argues in favour of interpreting the term as a Norse-derived loan-translation of the Viking Age Norse noun represented by OIc *vit-nismaðr* ‘witness’ instead of a native formation (see Harmer 1989: 535; cp. the *OED* 1989: s.v. *witnessman*, and Kries 2003: 334–35).

(I) ME *yēten* (OE *gēatan*)

Attestations: HomU 3 (Irv 7) 147

Discussion: see above, 2.4.2.K.

#### IV.2.4. Other Sources of Evidence

(A) ME (*a*)*yēven* *ūp* ‘to give up, surrender’

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1132.9, ChronE (Irvine) 1137.8, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.25, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.39, ChronE (Irvine) 1140.49–50, BenRW 2.19.28

Discussion: For a thorough study of the likely Norse influence on this construction (cp. OIc *gefa upp* ‘to give up, surrender’), which represents the first unequivocal use in English of the adverb with a completive meaning, see Denison’s discussion (Denison 1981: 285–90, and Denison 1985).

(B) ME *dien* ‘to die’

Attestations: LS 5 (InventCrossNap) 216

Discussion: Serjeantson (Serjeantson 1935: 70) would like to identify ‘dydon’, glossing L *defecerunt* (cp. L *deficere* ‘to withdraw, revolt; to fail, abandon, perish’) in PsGlE (Harsley) 15.13, as the first attestation of OE *\*dīegan* ‘to die’, which she analyses as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *deyja* ‘to die’). Yet Dance (Dance 2000: 375–76) has identified the form as the preterite plural of OE *dōn* ‘to do’ because the term seems to have originally been intended as a gloss for L *fecerunt* (cp. L *facere* ‘to do’). Once this form is rejected, the first attestation of the possibly Norse-derived verb is the infinitive ‘degen’ in LS 5 (InventCrossNap) 216. A full copy of the text is only preserved in the twelfth-century manuscript Oxford, Bodleian Library, MS Bodley 343 (see above, IV.1.20). However, as noted by Napier (Napier 1894: lviii–lix), the text in this manuscript is a copy of an eleventh-century translation of a Latin original. The

recovery of an eleventh-century leaf recording part of the text (see Colgrave and Hyde 1962: 60–67 and 75–77) gives credibility not only to Napier's suggestion, but also to Dance's argument in favour of considering 'degen' as 'a recent change to the wording of *Rood Tree*' (Dance 2000: 370), because there are a few other lexical disparities between the eleventh- and twelfth-century texts (cp. the *DOE*: s.v. *degan*, and Kitson 1990: 29 and 76).<sup>16</sup> See Dance 2000 for a thorough analysis of the possible Norse origin of the verb, and Klos 2010 for its adaptation into the Middle English lexicon.

(C) ME *grith* (cp. OE *grīð*) word-field

Discussion: see above, 2.5.I.

(C.1) ME *grith* (OE *grīð*)

Attestations: Ch 1110 (Harm 62) 29

(C.2) ME *grithbriche* (OE *grīðbryce*)

Attestations: Ch IIHen (Hearne) 3

(D) ME *hāmsōkne* (OE *hāmsōcn*)

Attestations: Ch IIHen (Hearne) 5–6

Discussion: See above, 2.5.K.

(E) ME *innen* + genitive

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1154.9

Discussion: OE *innan* + genitive is not uncommon in a locative sense (see Bosworth and Toller 1898: s.v. *innan* sense II), but it is not frequent at all in a temporal sense. It may therefore be the case that, as initially suggested by Einarsson (Einarsson 1938: 20), the construction has been influenced by the use of the Norse preposition represented by OIc *innan*, which commonly collocates with genitive to express time (cp. C. Clark 1970: 152 n. to l. 10 in the 1154-annal, and Swanton 2000: 268 n. 12).

(F) ME *nail knīf* 'nail knife'

Attestation: CollGl 25 15

Discussion: On the Norse origin of ME *knīf* (OE *cnīf*), see above, 2.5.B. While L *novacula* 'sharp knife, razor' is rendered by OE *nægelsex* 'knife for cut-

<sup>16</sup> Cp. 'dægað', which replaces the Ælfrician original 'acwelað' in the manuscript of the *Rood Tree* (see Pope 1967–68: I, 483 n. to l. 108 in the apparatus).



ting the nails' in *ÆGl* 320.16 (cp. *AntGl* 4 (Kindschi) 411), the determinatum of the compound is replaced in this later gloss (cp. above, 3.4.2.1.A).

(G) ME *unnīthing* (OE *unnīðing*)

Attestations: *OccGl* 55.2 (Först-Nap) 38

Discussion: On the Norse-derived character of the term, see above, 2.5.O. The derivative glosses L *non parcus* (cp. L *parcus* 'sparing, economical'). Förster and Napier argue that it should be understood in a non-legal sense, e.g. 'generous, non-stingy' (Förster and Napier 1906: 22–23) (cp. ME *mētenīthing* 'a person who gives food grudgingly').

### IV.3. Terms whose Norse Derivation Is More Problematic

(A) ME 'agene' ('beard on grain; an awn')

Attestations: *OccGl* 72 (Först-Nap) 6

Discussion: The term renders L *aristas* (cp. L *arista* 'awn or beard of an ear of grain'). Förster and Napier (Förster and Napier 1906: 21) would like to associate it with PDE *awn*, which is commonly considered to be Norse-derived because of the presence of the velar consonant (see Jordan 1974: §§93 and 112; cp. OIc *qgn* 'chaff, husks' < PGmc *\*azanō*; see Björkman 1900–02: 110–11, the *MED*: s.v. *aune*, de Vries 1961: s.v. *qgn*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *awn*, n., and Kries 2003: 279). There is, however, no reason not to associate the noun under analysis with the native cognate of the Old Norse term, viz. OE *\*ægne*, attested twice as the plural 'ægnan' in the *OEC* (*CorpGl* 2 (Hessels) 14.185 and 15.45; cp. OE *egenu* 'chaff'; cp. the *DOE*: s.v. *ægne*).

(B) ME *caiser* 'emperor'

Attestations: the English version of Mt 22.17, Mt 22.21, Mt 22.31, Mk 12.14, Mk 12.16, Lk 2.1, and Jn 19.12 in BL, MS Royal 1.A.xiv + Oxford, Bodl., MS Hatton 38 (see Reimann 1883: 25)<sup>17</sup>

Discussion: The presence of the diphthong in the root vowel suggests that this term is a foreign rather than a native reflex of L *Caesar* > PGmc *\*kaisar* (cf. OE *cāse*, attested in Mt (WSCp) 22.21 and Jn (WSCp) 19.12). As noted by Björkman (Björkman 1900–02: 56–57), it is, however, not clear whether the term has been borrowed from Old High German (cp. OHG *keisur*, *keisar*; see Reimann 1883: 25, and the *MED*: s.v. *caiser*) or from Old Norse (cp. OIc *kei-*

<sup>17</sup> These forms are not attested in the *OEC*, but are mentioned in the *DOE*.

*sari*), the Norse term being, in its turn, a likely loan-word from Low German (see F. Fischer 1909: 59, and de Vries 1961: s.v. *keisari*; cp. the *OED* 1989: s.v. *Kaiser*, and Dance 2003: 427–29).

(C) ME *claklēs* ‘free, unencumbered, guaranteed against legal claim’

Attestations: Ch Ranulf (Liebermann) 2

Discussion: Liebermann (Liebermann 1903: 283 n. 6, and 284) suggests that this adjective may be Norse-derived (cp. OIc *klakklauss* ‘unhurt, unscathed’). It may be the case, however, that this is a native adjective formed on the basis of OE *clacu* ‘injury’ (cp. ‘clæclease’ in ClGI 1 (Stryker), which renders L *inmunes* (cp. L *immunis* ‘free from evil, pure’; cp. the *MED*: s.v. *claklēs*, the *DOE*: s.v. *clæclēas*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *clake*).

(D) ME *fāren* (OE *faran* / *fēran*) *mid* ‘to deal in’

Attestation: ChronE (Irvine) 1132.6

Discussion: Clark suggests that ME *fāren mid* meaning ‘to deal in’ rather than ‘to travel with’ should be associated with the Viking Age Norse structure represented by OIc *fara með* ‘to deal in’ (C. Clark 1952–53: 87, and C. Clark 1970: lxix). However, as pointed out by Denison (Denison 1981: 291), the attestation of the structure with the same meaning in Ælfrician compositions (see the *DOE*: s.v. *fēran*, sense II.A.3, cp. the *DOE*: s.v. *faran*, sense II.A.3), suggests that the Norse and English structures are likely to have developed independently.

(E) ME *glāde*

Attestation: BenRW 4.25.21, where it appears in the phrase ‘ær sunne go tō glade’ (‘before the sun sets in’)

Discussion: Björkman has suggested that this term could be analysed as Norse-derived (cp. OIc *sólargaðan* ‘sunset’), although ‘Scand. origin is by no means certain’ (Björkman 1900–02: 160; cp. the *MED*: s.v. *glāde*, n.2, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *glade*, n.<sup>1</sup>). Given that the Norse term does not appear to have been common, and that its ultimate etymology remains unclear (de Vries 1961: s.v. *glāðan*, and the *OED* 1989: s.v. *glade*, n.<sup>1</sup> suggest a possible connection with OE *glæd* ‘bright, shining; cheerful’), an etymological judgement on the term under discussion has to remain suspended. Nothing in the dialectal distribution of the term during the Middle English period is, in any case, suggestive of Norse derivation: after the Wintenny Version of the Benedictine Rule, the term under analysis is recorded in Trevisa’s translation of the *Polychronicon* (see Gretsch 1978: 338–46, and Waldron 1991; cp. de Vries 1961: s.v. *glāðan*).

(F) ME *hōndfesten* ‘to betroth’

Attestation: LS 22 (InFestisSMarie) 43

Discussion: This verb is commonly assigned a Norse-derived character (cp. OIc *handfestr* ‘striking a bargain by joining hands’, *handfesta* ‘to strike a bargain by shaking hands, to pledge, to betroth’; see Björkman 1900–02: 242, Carr 1939: 29, the *MED*: s.v. *hōndfesten*, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *handfast*, v., and Kries 2003: 315). This would associate it with OE *fēstermann* and *feste*, other terms which have been attributed to the same Norse word-field (see above 2.3.1.2.A and 2.4.2.J). However, as noted by Förster (Förster 1925b: 20 n. 22a) and Dance (Dance 2003: 224–26), the Norse character of this verb is not very clear because its form is fully native, and one should take into account OE *handfestnung*, which is recorded as a gloss on various occasions (viz. PrudGl 4 (Meritt) 41, where it glosses L *chirographo*, cp. L *chirographum* ‘handwriting, autograph; a bond, surety or obligation under one’s own hand’, and ClGl 1 (Stryker) 4169 = AntGl 2 (Kindschi) 410, where it renders L *mandatum* ‘consensual contract’). There is no reason to argue in favour of the Norse derivation of this noun. When glossing L *chirographum*, it can be associated with OHG *hantfesti* and MLG and MDu. *handveste* (cp. Meritt 1945: 29 n. for 37.41), and these compounds can be interpreted as independent loan-translations of L *manufirmatio* ‘validation of a document by laying a hand on it’ (see Niermeyer and others 2002: s.v. *manufirmatio*; cp. Carr 1939: 29). Its attestation in the Cleopatra and Antwerp glossaries is clearly associated with the Isidorean context whence the lemma derives: ‘Mandatum dictum, quod olim in commisso negotio alter alteri manu dabat’ (Lindsay 1911: V.xxiv.20) (‘a *mandatum* (‘consensual contract’) is so called because, formerly, in a business transaction, one person would “shake hands” (*manus dabat*) with the other’, according to Barney and others 2006: 120).<sup>18</sup> The compound could, therefore, be understood in this context as an ad hoc coinage to render the Latin text. However, it may also be the case that it hints at the existence of OE *handfestan*, with the same general meaning as OIc *handfesta*, i.e. ‘to strike a bargain by shaking hands, to pledge’. From this perspective, the specific meaning ‘to betroth’ could be analysed as a semantic loan. However, if we believe in the existence of OE *handfestan* with the aforementioned meaning, there is not much need to rely on foreign influence for the semantic specialization from ‘striking a bargain [or any other business] by shaking hands’ to ‘establishing a betrothal by shaking hands’. Thus, Dance’s comment that ‘positive evidence for origin in Old Norse remains slim’ (Dance 2003: 426) is very appropriate.

<sup>18</sup> On this context and its belonging to a set of glosses which are likely to derive from an epitome of the *Etymologiae*, see Rusche 1996: 127–34 and 372.

**(G)** ME *God and gōde men* ‘God and good men’

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1137.71

Discussion: Olszewska (Olszewska 1933: 81), following Onions (Onions 1931), suggests that this alliterative expression is Norse-derived because Scandinavian texts also show the co-ordination of the equivalent terms (see Jesch 1992). It may, however, be better to consider that the alliterative phrases were independently associated in the two Germanic languages (cp. C. Clark 1970: 109 n. to l. 75) and that the use of ME *gōde men* in this context is a reflection of the Latin phrase *boni homines*, commonly used in Continental sources as well (see Niermeyer and others 2002: s.v. *bonus*; cp. B. Sawyer 2000: 111, and Dance 2011: 106).

**(H)** ME *grēva* (OE ‘groefa’)

Attestations: Ch Thomas (Liebermann) 9 and 11

Discussion: see above, III.3.2.H.

**(I)** ME *herberwe* (OE *herebeorg*) word-field

Discussion: see above, III.4.HH.

**(I.1)** ME *herberwe* (OE *herebeorg*)

Attestations: LS 22 (InFestisSMarie) 98

**(I.2)** ME *herberwen* ‘to give shelter, entertain’ (OE *herebeorgian*)

Attestations: LS 22 (InFestisSMarie) 111

Discussion: The verb is likely to be a new formation on the basis of OE *herbeorg* (cp. the MED: s.v. *herberwen*).

**(J)** ME *infangenethēf* (OE *infangenedēof*)

Attestations: Ch 1122 (Harm 78) 4, Ch 1123 (Harm 79) 4

Discussion: see above, III.4.OO.

**(K)** ME *lēten oute* (OE *lætan ūt*) ‘to release’

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1140.32–33

Discussion: Clark would like to derive this verbal phrase from the Viking Age Norse structure represented by OIc *láta út* ‘to release’ (C. Clark 1952–53: 87). However, as noted by Denison, the attestation in Old English texts of *lætan inn* ‘to let in’ (e.g. *ÆCHom* II, 28 222.31) and *forlætan ūt* ‘to let go out’ (e.g. And 968) makes this derivation unnecessary (Denison 1981: 285).

**(L)** ME *'mynna'* ('wish, desire, consent')

Attestations: Ch 1243 (Harm 121) 3

Discussion: Harmer suggests that *'mynna'* in the above context may represent OE *myne* 'memory; feeling; purpose, desire, wish' in meaning, but the Norse term represented by Olc *minni* 'memory' in form (Harmer 1989: 423). However, there are two problems with this analysis:

**(L.1)** Harmer points out herself that the thirteenth-century copy of the original text was made 'by a man who had before him a copy in Anglo-Saxon script, but was not accustomed to Anglo-Saxon script or language' (Harmer 1989: 421); therefore, it may be the case that <mynna> is simply a spelling variant of OE *myne*.

**(L.2)** <m> may represent a dittograph, because the term is preceded by the possessive *'myne'*, and as pointed out by Harmer, the original term may actually have been OE *unne* 'favour, approval, permission' (Harmer 1989: 423; cp. Ch 1067 (Harm 7) 2).

**(M)** ME *ðk* (OE *ðc*)

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1132.8, 1137.31, 1137.44, 1137.49, 1137.76, 1140.10, 1140.52, 1140.56, and 1140.63

Discussion: see above, 2.5.P.

**(N)** Preterite plural forms

Attestations: *'forbaren'*: ChronE (Irvine) 1137.43 and 1137.45; *'drapen'*: ChronE (Irvine) 1137.24 and 1137.32; *'iafen'* / *'aiauen'*: ChronE (Irvine) 1137.8 and 1140.42; *'stali'*: ChronE (Irvine) 1140.28; *'waren'*: ChronE (Irvine) 1137.41, etc. (see Kniezsa 1994: 243)

Discussion: As noted by Kniezsa (Kniezsa 1994: 239), the presence of <a> instead of the expected <æ> in these preterite forms of strong verbs of Classes IV and V has sometimes been attributed to Norse influence, which would have led to the presence of /ɑ:/ as opposed to OE /æ:/ (see Heusler 1950: §§309–10, and A. Campbell 1959: §§742–43). It may be better, however, to explain these forms as 'early examples of influence on the pret. pl. from the pret. s., later common in the East Midlands' (C. Clark 1970: lxix n. 1).

**(O)** ME *pulewar* (OE *pylewer*)

Attestation: CollGl 25 20

Discussion: see above, III.4.BBB.

## (P) ME 'scattered' ('scattered')

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1137.4

Discussion: Serjeantson (Serjeantson 1935: 74–75) mentions this preterite form as one exemplifying the development of doublets with native /ʃ/ vs Norse-derived /sk/ in Middle English (see above, III.4.III; cp. the *OED* 1989: s.v. *scatter*, v.). She points out that this form would be an Anglo-Scandinavian new formation with Scandinavian pronunciation imposed on a native term, for there is not a clear Norse etymon it could be associated with. The etymology of PDE *scatter* and *shatter*, however, remains unclear, as there is not an Old English verb they could be associated with either (see the *OED* 1989: s.vv. *scatter*, v., and *shatter*, v.). Furthermore, there is nothing in the form of this verb to suggest that it would have been pronounced with /sk/ instead of /ʃ/.

## (Q) ME 'scæ' 'she'

Attestations: ChronE (Irvine) 1140.20, 1140.46, 1140.47, 1140.59, and 1140.66

Discussion: The development of PDE *she* is still a highly debated topic (see Howe 1996: 145–52). The influence of the Anglo-Scandinavian pronunciation of the pronoun has been presented as one of the explanations: the people of Norwegian ancestry settled in Northumbria would have pronounced the pronoun as /xjo:/ and this would have been reinterpreted as [çø:] or [ʃø:] (see Dieth 1955, and Horobin and Smith 2002: 130–31; see also Werner 1991: 391–94). This explanation is, however, not free from problems (see Lass 1992b: 118–19, Lass 2006: 74–75, D. Britton 1991, and Howe 1996: 151); accordingly, the origin of the pronoun has to be left unsettled.

(R) ME *sēte* 'seat'

Attestations: BenRW 9.44.3

Discussion: Old English texts record various nouns which represent ablaut by-forms of the root whence OE *sittan* 'to sit' and *set* 'stall, seat' derive, viz. PGmc \**set-*: e.g. *sæt* 'ambush' < PGmc \**sētō* (cp. OIc *sát* 'ambush'), and *sæte* 'house' < PGmc \**sētōn*. It is, however, generally claimed that ME *sēte* 'seat' is Norse-derived (cp. OIc *sæti* 'seat' < PGmc \**sētjan*; see Björkman 1900–02: 253, the *MED*: s.v. *sēte*, n.2, the *OED* 1989: s.v. *seat*, n., Dance 2003: 375, and Kries 2003: 329). Indeed, if we suggest that it should be associated with the same root as OIc *sæti* (and OHG *gisâzi* 'seat, resting place, dwelling'), the expected native reflex would have been \**sēte* not 'sæte' (OE \**sæte*), as attested in the text. It could nonetheless be the case that the term under consideration is identical with OE *sæte* 'house' and that it is only the meaning 'seat' that may have

been borrowed from Old Norse (cp. the *MED*: s.v. *sēte*, n.2, sense 4). Yet, given the association of the term with the verb ‘to sit’, the meaning ‘seat’ could have developed by native means (cp. the polysemy of OHG *gisāzi*); this development could, of course, have been helped by the presence of the Norse term.

(S) ME ‘pay(e)’

Attestations: Rec 28.1 (Earle) 29, Rec 28.1 (Earle) 31, Rec 28.3 (Earle) 4

Discussion: Morsbach (Morsbach 1929: 126) considers that the occurrences of *ðay(e)* in these texts should be understood as a mistake for *ðā* (adverb) + *ðe*; consequently, it does not have to be associated with the Norse-derived personal pronoun *they*. *De* should be interpreted as an article in Rec 28.1 (Earle) 29 and as a relative pronoun in Rec 28.1 (Earle) 31, where it has been repeated by mistake. For an alternative explanation, see above, III.1.1.A.

(T) ME *unwine* (OE *unwine*)

Attestations: LS 22 (InFestisSMarie) 18

Discussion: see above, III.4.WWW.

(U) ME *wōld* (on its meaning, see below)

Attestations: Ch 1243 (Harm 121) 6

Discussion: The reflex of OE *weald* ‘forest, wood, grove’ seems to mean instead ‘plain, field’ in the above context, where it appears in the formula ‘on weald, on freyð, on heyninga’ (‘in plain, in woodland, in enclosures’), as translated by Harmer (Harmer 1989: 424; cp. the common collocation ‘on wuda and on felda’, e.g. LawIICn 80, Ch 988 (Harm 30) 4–5). Given the northern provenance of the text (see above, IV.1.3), Harmer (Harmer 1989: 533 n. to l. 6) may be right when suggesting that the noun under consideration has adopted the meaning of the Norse cognate (cp. OIc *vøllr* ‘untilled field, plain’). However, as suggested by Smith, this semantic change could also have been a native development:

With the clearing of large forest-tracts, some of which like the Weald of Kent were on high ground, the term *wald* came to lose its association with woodland and now described the newly developed type of landscape; in ME there are a few allusions to *wald* meaning ‘woodland’, but there is an increasing number of contexts which suggest the meaning ‘hill, down’. (A. H. Smith 1970: s.v. *wald*)

Furthermore, the *DOE* (s.v. *fyrhþ*, *fyrhþe*) explains that OE *fyrhð* (here attested as ‘freyð’) could also mean ‘clearing or meadow’; thus, it may be the case that *weald* in Ch 1243 (Harm 121) 6 should be associated with OE *wudu*, and *fyrhð* in this case with OE *feld*.



(V) ME *witter* (OE *wit(t)er*) word-field

Discussion: see above, III.4.EEEE.

(V.1) ME *witteren* 'to give information'

Attestations: LS 22 (InFestisSMarie) 47

Discussion: Even though it has sometimes been suggested that the verb is a Norse-derived term based on the Viking Age Norse verb represented by OIc *vitra* 'to manifest, reveal' (Björkman 1900–02: 258, with references; see also the *MED*: s.v. *witteren*), this verb could also be a new formation on the basis of OE *witter*.

(V.2) ME *witterlice* 'wisely'

Attestations: *ÆHomM* 1 (Bel 9) 158, *ÆHomM* 1 (Bel 9) 223 (cf. *ÆLS* (Christmas) 90 and 165, where OE *witodlice* is used instead), *ÆHomM* 1 (Bel 9) 267, *ÆHomM* 1 (Bel 9) 288, *HomU* 1 (Irv 5) 35, *HomU* 1 (Irv 5) 120, *HomU* 2 (Irv 6) 156

Discussion: see Kitson 1990: 76.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aakjær, Svend. 1927–28. ‘Old Danish Thegns and Drengs’, *Acta Philologica Scandinavica*, 2: 1–30
- Abels, Richard. 2008. ‘Household Men, Mercenaries and Vikings in Anglo-Saxon England’, in *Mercenaries and Paid Men: The Mercenary Identity in the Middle Ages: Proceedings of a Conference Held at University of Wales, Swansea, 7th–9th July 2005*, ed. by John France (Leiden: Brill), pp. 143–65
- Abrams, Lesley. 1995. ‘The Anglo-Saxons and the Christianisation of Scandinavia’, *Anglo-Saxon England*, 24: 213–49
- Abrams, Lesley, and David N. Parsons. 2004. ‘Place-Names and the History of Scandinavian Settlement in England’, in *Land, Sea and Home: Proceedings of a Conference on Viking-Period Settlement, at Cardiff, July 2001*, ed. by John Hines and others, The Society for Medieval Archaeology Monograph, 30 (Leeds: Maney), pp. 379–431
- Ahern, Donald Edward. 1975. ‘An Edition of Two Old English Saints’ Lives: *The Life of St. Giles* and *The Life of St. Nicholas*’ (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona)
- Aitchison, Jean. 1987. *Words in the Mind: An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon* (Oxford: Blackwell)
- , 2003. *Words in the Mind: An Introduction to the Mental Lexicon*, 3rd edn (Oxford: Blackwell)
- Allen, Cynthia L. 1997a. ‘The Development of an “Impersonal” Verb in Middle English: The Case of *Behoove*’, in *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 103 (Berlin: Gruyter), pp. 1–21
- , 1997b. ‘Middle English Case Loss and the “Creolization Hypothesis”’, *English Language and Linguistics*, 1: 63–89
- , 2000. ‘Obsolescence and Sudden Death in Syntax: The Decline of Verb-Final Order in Early Middle English’, in *Generative Theory and Corpus Studies: A Dialogue from 10 ICEHL*, ed. by Ricardo Bermúdez-Otero and others, Topics in English Linguistics, 31 (Berlin: Gruyter), pp. 3–25
- Amira, Carl von. 1922. *Die germanischen Todesstrafen: Untersuchungen zur Rechts- und Religionsgeschichte*, Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften,

- Philosophisch-philologische und historische Klasse, 31.3 (München: Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften)
- [AND =] *Anglo-Norman Dictionary*, ed. by David A. Trotter and others, 2nd edn, 2005–, <<http://www.anglo-norman.net/>> [accessed from 12 February 2007 to 20 April 2007]
- Anlezark, Daniel, ed. and trans. 2009. *The Old English Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn*, Anglo-Saxon Texts, 7 (Cambridge: Brewer)
- Antonsen, Elmer H. 1961. 'Germanic Umlaut Anew', *Language*, 37: 215–30
- , 1967. "Proto-Scandinavian" and Common Nordic', *Scandinavian Studies*, 39: 16–39
- , 1975. *A Concise Grammar of the Older Runic Inscriptions*, Sprachstrukturen, A.3 (Tübingen: Niemeyer)
- , 1994. 'The Earliest Attested Germanic Language, Revisited', *North-Western European Language Evolution*, 23: 41–68
- , 2002. *Runes and Germanic Linguistics*, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 140 (Berlin: Gruyter)
- Ardenne, S. R. T. O. d' (ed.). 1961. *De liflade ant te passion of Seinte Iulienne*, Early English Text Society, o.s., 248 (London: Oxford University Press)
- Arngart, Olof (ed.). 1968. *The Middle English Genesis and Exodus: Re-Edited from C.C.C.C. 444 with Introduction, Notes and Glossary*, Lund Studies in English, 36 (Lund: Gleerup)
- Arnold, Thomas (ed.). 1882–85. *Symeonis Monachi Opera omnia*, *Rerum britannicarum mediæ ævi scriptores*, 75, 2 vols (London: Longman)
- Åqvist, Gösta. 1968. *Frieden und Eidschwur: Studien zum Mittelalterlichen germanisches Recht*, Skrifter utgivna av Institutet för Rättshistorisk Forskning grundat av Gustav och Carin Olin, Series 1: Rättshistoriskt Bibliotek, 14 (Lund: Blom)
- Assmann, Bruno (ed.). 1889. *Angelsächsischen Homilien und Heiligenleben*, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, 3 (Kassel: Wigand)
- Astill, Grenville. 1988. 'Rural Settlement: The Toft and the Croft', in *The Countryside of Medieval England*, ed. by Grenville Astill and Annie Grant (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 38–61
- Bailey, Charles James N., and Karl Maroldt. 1977. 'The French Lineage of English', in *Langues en contact – Pidgins – Creoles*, ed. by Jürgen M. Meisel (Tübingen: Narr), pp. 21–53
- Baker, Peter S. 1980. 'The Old English Canon of Byrhtferth of Ramsey', *Speculum*, 55: 22–37
- , (ed.). 2000. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, VIII: MS F (Cambridge: Brewer)
- Baker, Peter S., and Michael Lapidge (eds). 1995. *Byrhtferth's Enchiridion*, Early English Text Society, s.s., 15 (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Bammesberger, Alfred. 1968. 'Altenglisch *subt* und *-siht*', *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*, 23: 5–6
- , 1979. *Beiträge zu einem etymologischen Wörterbuch des Altenglischen: Berichtigungen und Nachträge zum Altenglischen etymologischen Wörterbuch von Ferdinand Holthausen*, Anglistische Forschungen, 139 (Heidelberg: Winter)

- , 1983. 'The Old English Adjective *ambyre*', *Modern Language Review*, 64: 97–101
- , 1990. *Die Morphologie des urgermanischen Nomens*, Untersuchungen zur vergleichenden Grammatik der germanischen Sprachen, 2 (Heidelberg: Winter)
- Bandle, Oskar, and others (eds). 2002–05. *The Nordic Languages: An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages*, Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft, 22, 2 vols (Berlin: Gruyter)
- Banham, Debby. 2006. 'A Millennium of Medicine? New Medical Texts and Ideas in England in the Eleventh Century', in *Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed. by Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smyth (Dublin: Four Courts), pp. 230–42
- Barlow, Frank. 1970. *Edward the Confessor* (London: Eyre Methuen)
- Barnes, Michael P. 1993. 'Language', in *Medieval Scandinavia: An Encyclopedia*, ed. by Phillip Pulsiano and others (London: Garland), pp. 376–79
- , 1997. 'How "Common" was Common Scandinavian?', *North-Western European Language Evolution*, 31/32: 29–42
- , 1999. *A New Introduction to Old Norse, Part I: Grammar* (London: Viking Society for Northern Research)
- , 2003. 'Standardisation and Variation in Migration- and Viking-Age Scandinavian', in *Útnorður: West Nordic Standardisation and Variation: Papers from a Symposium in Stockholm, October 7th 2001*, ed. by Kristján Árnason (Reykjavík: University of Iceland Press), pp. 47–66
- , 2005. 'Language', in *A Companion to Old Norse Icelandic Literature and Culture*, ed. by Rory McTurk (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 173–89
- Barnes, Michael P., and others. 1997. *The Runic Inscriptions of Viking Age Dublin* (Dublin: Royal Irish Academy)
- Barney, Stephen A., and others (trans). 2006. *The 'Etymologies' of Isidore of Seville* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Barrow, G. W. S. 1969. 'Northern English Society in the Early Middle Ages', *Northern History*, 4: 1–28
- Bately, Janet. 1970. 'King Alfred and the Old English Translation of Orosius', *Anglia*, 88: 433–60
- , 1982. 'Lexical Evidence for the Authorship of the Prose Psalms in the Paris Psalter', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 10: 69–95
- , 1985. 'The Compilation of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle Once More', *Leeds Studies in English*, 16: 7–26
- , (ed.). 1986. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition, III: MS A* (Cambridge: Brewer)
- , 2003. 'Bravery and the Vocabulary of Bravery in *Beowulf* and the *Battle of Maldon*', in *Unlocking the Wordboard: Anglo-Saxon Studies in Memory of Edward B. Irving, Jr.*, ed. by Mark C. Amodio and Katherine O'Brien O'Keeffe (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), pp. 274–301
- , 2006. 'The Language of Ohthere's Report to King Alfred: Some Problems and Some Puzzles for Historians and Linguists', in *Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed. by Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smyth (Dublin: Four Courts), pp. 39–53

- Bates, David (ed.). 1998. *Regesta regum Anglo-Normannorum: The Acta of William I (1066–1087)* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Bauer, Laurie. 1983. *English Word-Formation*, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Baugh, Albert C., and Thomas Cable. 1993. *A History of the English Language*, 4th edn (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall)
- Baxter, Stephen. 2004. 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Administration of God's Property', in *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, ed. by Matthew Townend, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages*, 10 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 161–205
- , 2007a. *The Earls of Mercia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- , 2007b. 'MS C of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Politics of Mid-Eleventh-Century England', *English Historical Review*, 122: 1189–1227
- Bazire, Joyce, and James E. Cross (eds.). 1989. *Eleven Old English Rogationtide Homilies*, 2nd edn (London: King's College)
- Benediktsson, Hreinn. 1963. 'Some Aspects of Nordic Umlaut and Breaking', *Language*, 39: 409–31
- , 1964. 'Old Norse Short *e*: One Phoneme or Two?', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 79: 63–104
- , 1974. 'The Common Nordic Vowel System', *Scandinavian Studies*, 46: 89–101
- , 1982. 'Nordic Umlaut and Breaking: Thirty Years of Research (1951–1980)', *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, 5: 1–60
- Bennett, J. A. W., and G. V. Smithers (eds.). 1968. *Early Middle English Verse and Prose*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Benskin, Michael, and Margaret Laing. 1981. 'Translations and *Mischsprachen* in Middle English Manuscripts', in *So meny people longages and tonges: Philological Essays in Scots and Medieval English Presented to Angus McIntosh*, ed. by Michael Benskin and M. L. Samuels (Edinburgh: Middle English Dialect Project), pp. 55–106
- Bergener, Carl. 1928. *A Contribution to the Study of the Conversion of Adjectives into Nouns in English* (Lund: Håkan Ohlsson)
- Bergman, Ingela, and others. 2007. 'Stones in the Snow: A Norse Fur Traders' Road into Sami Country', *Antiquity*, 81: 397–408
- Bergsten, Nils. 1911. *A Study of Compound Substantives in English* (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell)
- Berkhout, Carl T. 1974. 'Feld dennade—Again', *English Language Notes*, 11: 161–62
- Bethurum, Dorothy. 1932. 'Stylistic Features of the Old English Laws', *Modern Language Review*, 27: 263–79
- , 1950. 'Six Anonymous Old English Codes', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 49: 449–63
- Bibire, Paul. 2001. 'North Sea Language Contact in the Early Middle Ages: English and Norse', in *The North Sea World in the Middle Ages: Studies in the Cultural History of North-Western Europe*, ed. by Thomas R. Liskza and Lorna E. M. Walker (Dublin: Four Courts), pp. 88–107

- Bibire, Paul, and Alan S. C. Ross. 1981. 'The Differences between Lindisfarne and Rushworth Two', *Notes and Queries*, 226: 98–116
- Birch, Walter de Gray (ed.). 1885–93. *Cartularium Saxonicum: A Collection of Charters Relating to Anglo-Saxon History*, 3 vols (London: Whiting)
- Bjork, Robert E. 2001. 'Scandinavian Relations', in *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*, ed. by Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 388–99
- Björkman, Erik. 1900–02. *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, Studien zur englischen Philologie, 7 and 11, 2 vols (Halle: Niemeyer)
- , 1901. *Zur dialektischen Provenienz der nordischen Lehnwörter im Englischen*, Språkvetenskapliga Sällskapet i Upsala Förhandlingar, 1898–1901 (Uppsala: Universitets Arskrift)
- , 1910. *Nordische Personennamen in England in alt- und frühmittel-englischer Zeit: ein Beitrag zur englischer Namenkunde*, Studien zur Englischen Philologie, 37 (Halle: Niemeyer)
- , 1913. 'Die "festeren" des Ælfric', in *Festschrift für Lorenz Morsbach dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern*, ed. by F. Holthausen and H. Spies, Studien zur englischen Philologie, 50 (Halle: Niemeyer)
- , 1917. 'Wortgeschichtliche Kleinigkeiten', *Bleibatt zur Anglia*, 28: 313–17
- Bjorvand, Harald, and Fredrik Otto Lindeman (eds). 2007. *Våre arveord: etymologisk ordbok*, 2nd edn (Oslo: Novus)
- Blair, John. 1998. *Anglo-Saxon Oxfordshire* (Stroud: Sutton)
- Blake, Norman F. 1978. 'The Genesis of *The Battle of Maldon*', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 7: 119–29
- , 1992. 'Literary Language', in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, II: 1066–1476, ed. by Norman Blake (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 500–41
- , 1996. *A History of the English Language* (Basingstoke: Macmillan)
- Bloomfield, Morton W. 1969. 'Beowulf, Byrhtnoth, and the Judgement of God: Trial by Combat in Anglo-Saxon England', *Speculum*, 44: 545–67
- Bøe, Arne, and others. 1962. 'Jarl', in *Kulturhistorisk leksikon for nordisk middelalder*, ed. by John Danstrup and others, 22 vols (København: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1956–82) VII: *Hovedstad-Judarård*, pp. 559–66
- Boisacq, Émile (ed.). 1950. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: étudiée dans ses rapports avec les autres langues indo-européennes*, 4th edn (Heidelberg: Winter)
- Bolton, Timothy. 2009. *The Empire of Cnut the Great: Conquest and Consolidation of Power in Northern Europe in the Early Eleventh Century*, The Northern World, 40 (Leiden: Brill)
- Bosworth, Joseph, and T. Northcote Toller (eds). 1898. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary* (London: Oxford University Press)
- Boutkan, Dirk. 1995. *The Germanic 'Auslautgesetze'*, Leiden Studies in Indo-European, 4 (Amsterdam: Rodopi)
- Boutkan, Dirk, and Sjoerd Michiel Siebinga (eds). 2005. *Old Frisian Etymological Dictionary*, Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionaries, 1 (Leiden: Brill)

- Bradley, S. A. J. (trans.). 1982. *Anglo-Saxon Poetry* (London: Dent)
- Brate, Erik. 1884. *Nordische Lehnwörter im Ormulum*, Sonderabdruck aus den Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur, 10 (Upsala: Halle)
- , (ed.). 1911–18. *Östergötlands runinskrifter*, Sveriges runinskrifter, 2, 3 vols (Stockholm: Norstedt)
- Brate, Erik, and Elias Wessén (eds). 1924–36. *Södermanlands runinskrifter*, Sveriges runinskrifter, 3, 4 vols (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell)
- Braune, Wilhelm. 2004. *Althochdeutsche Grammatik 1: Laut- und Formenlehre*, 15th edn rev. by Ingo Reiffenstein (Tübingen: Niemeyer)
- Bredehoft, Thomas A. 2001. *Textual Histories: Readings in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press)
- , 2005. *Early English Metre* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press)
- , 2009. *Authors, Audiences and Old English Verse* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press)
- , 2010. 'Malcolm and Margaret: The Poem in Annal 1067D', in *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History*, ed. by Alice Jorgensen, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 23 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 31–48
- Breeze, Andrew. 1992. 'The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle for 1072 and the Fords of Frew, Scotland', *Notes and Queries*, 237: 269–70
- Breisch, Agneta. 1994. *Frid och fredlöshet: sociala band och utanförskap på Island under äldre medeltid*, Studia historica Upsaliensia, 174 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell)
- Brink, Stefan. 2002. 'Law and Legal Customs in Viking Age Scandinavia', in *The Scandinavians from the Vendel Period to the Tenth Century: An Ethnographic Perspective*, ed. by Judith Jesch, Studies in Historical Archaeoethnology (Woodbridge: Boydell), pp. 87–117
- British Museum, Department of Manuscripts. 1895–96. *Catalogue of the Stowe Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 2 vols (London: British Museum)
- Britton, Derek. 1991. 'On Middle English *she*, *sho*: A Scots Solution to an English Problem', *North-West European Language Evolution*, 17: 3–51
- Britton, G. C. 1957. 'Studies in the Etymology of the Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Birmingham)
- Brøndum-Nielsen, Johannes. 1935. *Gammeldansk grammatik i sproghistorisk fremstilling*, III: *Sustantivernes deklination* (København: Schultz)
- , 1950. *Gammeldansk grammatik i sproghistorisk fremstilling*, I: *Indledning, tekst-kildernes lyd betegneelse, vokalisme*, 2nd edn (København: Schultz)
- , 1965. *Gammeldansk grammatik i sproghistorisk fremstilling*, V: *Pronominer* (København: Akademisk)
- Brooks, Nicholas. 1984. *The Early History of the Church of Canterbury: Christ Church from 597 to 1066*, Studies in the Early History of Britain (London: Leicester University Press)
- Brown, Michelle P. 2003. *The Lindisfarne Gospels: Society, Spirituality and the Scribe* (London: British Library)
- Brunner, Heinrich. 1906–28. *Deutsche Rechtsgeschichte*, Systematisches Handbuch der deutschen Rechtswissenschaft, 2, 2 vols (München: Duncker)



- Brunner, Karl. 1965. *Altenglische Grammatik nach der Angelsächsischen Grammatik von Eduard Sievers*, Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte Hauptreihe, 3, 3rd edn (Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1965)
- Bugge, Sophus. 1888. 'Zur altgermanischen Sprachgeschichte: germanisch *ug* aus *uw*', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 13: 504–15
- , 1910a. 'Det oldnorske Kvad om Vølund (Vølundarkviða) og dets Forhold til engelske Sagn', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 22: 33–77
- , 1910b. *Der runstein von Rök in Östergötland, Schweden*, ed. by Magnus Olsen and others (Stockholm: Ivar Hæggström)
- Caie, Graham P. (ed.). 2000. *The Old English Poem 'Judgement Day II': A Critical Edition with Editions of 'De die iudicii' and the Hatton 113 Homily 'Be domes dæge'*, Anglo-Saxon Texts, 2 (Cambridge: Brewer)
- Caldwell, Sarah J. G. 1974. *The Relative Pronoun in Early Scots*, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki, 42 (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique)
- Caluwé-Dor, Juliette de. 1979. 'The Chronology of the Scandinavian Loan-Verbs in the Katharine Group', *English Studies*, 60: 680–85
- Campbell, Alistair (ed.). 1938. *The Battle of Brunanburh* (London: Heinemann)
- Campbell, Alistair. 1959. *Old English Grammar* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- , (ed.). 1962. *The Chronicle of Æthelweard: Chronicon Æthelwardi* (London: Nelson)
- , 1967. 'The Glosses', in *The Vespasian Psalter: British Museum Cotton Vespasian A.i.*, ed. by David H. Wright, Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile, 14 (København: Rosenkilde and Bagger), pp. 81–92
- , 1972. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Enlarged Addenda and Corrigenda to the Supplement by T. Northcote Toller* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Campbell, Jackson J. 1963. 'Prayers from MS Arundel 155', *Anglia*, 81: 82–117
- Campbell, James. 1989. 'The Sale of Land and the Economics of Power in Early England: Problems and Possibilities', *Haskins Society Journal*, 1: 23–37
- Cannon, Christopher. 2005. 'Between the Old and the Middle of English', *New Medieval Literatures*, 7: 302–21
- Carr, Charles T. 1939. *Nominal Compounds in Germanic*, St Andrews University Publications, 41 (London: Humphrey Milford)
- Carroll, Jayne. 2001. 'Poetic Discourse in Viking Age England: Texts and Contexts' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Nottingham)
- , 2010. 'Coins and the Chronicle: Mint-Signatures, History, and Language', in *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History*, ed. by Alice Jorgensen, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 23 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 243–73
- Carson, Thomas, and others (eds). 2003. *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd edn (Detroit: Gale in association with the Catholic University of America)
- Carter, Ronald. 1982. 'A Note on Core Vocabulary', *Nottingham Linguistic Circular*, 11.2: 39–50
- , 1987. 'Is There a Core Vocabulary? Some Implications for Language Teaching', *Applied Linguistics*, 8: 178–93
- , 1998. *Vocabulary: Applied Linguistic Perspectives*, 2nd edn (London: Routledge)

- Catto, Jeremy. 1981. 'Andre Horn: Law and History in Fourteenth-Century England', in *The Writing of History in the Middle Ages: Essays Presented to Richard William Southern*, ed. by Ralph Henry Carless Davies and J. M. Wallace-Hadrill (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 367–91
- Cavill, Paul, and others (eds). 2000. *Wirral and its Viking Heritage* (Nottingham: Place-Name Society)
- Cavill, Paul, and others. 2003–04. 'Revisiting Dingesmere', *Journal of the English Place-Name Society*, 36: 25–38
- Chantraine, Pierre (ed.). 1968. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: histoire des mots*, 2 vols (Paris: Klincksieck)
- Chaplais, Pierre. 1965–69. 'The Anglo-Saxon Chancery: From the Diploma to the Writ', *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, 3: 160–76
- , 1981. 'The Authenticity of the Royal Anglo-Saxon Diplomas of Exeter', *Essays in Medieval Diplomacy and Administration*, by Pierre Chaplais (London: Hambledon), no. xv (first publ. in *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research*, 39 (1966): 1–34)
- , 1995. 'The Royal Anglo-Saxon "Chancery" of the Tenth Century Revisited', in *Studies in Medieval History Presented to R. H. C. Davis*, ed. by Henry Mayr-Harting and R. I. Moore (London: Hambledon), pp. 41–51
- Chapman, Don W. 1995. 'Stylistic Use of Nominal Compounds in Wulfstan's Sermons' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto)
- , 1998. 'Motivations for Producing and Analyzing Compounds in Wulfstan's Sermons', in *Advances in English Historical Linguistics* (1996), ed. by Jacek Fisiak and Marcin Krygier, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 112 (Berlin: Gruyter), pp. 15–21
- Charles-Edwards, T. M. 1972. 'Kingship, Status and the Origins of the Hide', *Past and Present*, 56: 3–33
- Christophersen, Axel. 1981–82. 'Drengs, Thegns, Landmen and Kings: Some Aspects on the Forms of Social Relations in Viking Society during the Transition to Historic Times', *Meddelanden från Lunds Universitets Historiska Museum*, n.s., 4: 115–34
- Clark, Cecily. 1952–53. 'Studies in the Vocabulary of the *Peterborough Chronicle*, 1070–1154', *English and Germanic Studies*, 5: 67–89
- , (ed.). 1970. *The Peterborough Chronicle 1070–1154*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- , 1983. 'On Dating *The Battle of Maldon*: Certain Evidence Reviewed', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 27: 1–22
- Clark, John, and Collin Yallop. 1990. *An Introduction to Phonetics and Phonology* (Oxford: Blackwell)
- Clark Hall, J. R. (ed.). 1960. *A Concise Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, 4th edn with a supplement by Herbert D. Meritt (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Classen, E., and F. E. Harmer (eds). 1926. *An Anglo-Saxon Chronicle from British Museum Cotton MS., Tiberius B.IV* (Manchester: Manchester University Press)
- Cleasby, Richard, and Gudbrand Vigfusson (eds). 1874. *An Icelandic-English Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

- , 1957. *An Icelandic-English Dictionary*, 2nd edn with a supplement by William A. Craigie (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Clemoes, P. 1974a. 'The Composition of the Old English Text', in *The Old English Illustrated Hexateuch, British Museum, Cotton Claudius B. IV*, ed. by C. R. Dodwell and Peter Clemoes, *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile*, 18 (København: Rosenkilde and Bagger), pp. 42–53
- , 1974b. 'The Production of an Illustrated Version', in *The Old English Illustrated Hexateuch, British Museum, Cotton Claudius B. IV*, ed. by C. R. Dodwell and Peter Clemoes, *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile*, 18 (København: Rosenkilde and Bagger), pp. 54–58
- , 2000. 'The Chronology of Ælfric's Works', in *Old English Prose: Basic Readings*, ed. by Paul E. Szarmach, *Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England*, 5 (New York: Garland), pp. 29–72 (first publ. in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of their History and Culture Presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. by Peter Clemoes (London: Bowes, 1959), pp. 212–47)
- Clunies Ross, Margaret. 2005. *A History of Old Norse Poetry and Poetics* (Cambridge: Brewer)
- Coates, Richard. 1982. 'Phonology and the Lexicon: A Case Study of Early English Forms in -gg-', *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 87: 195–222
- , 1997. 'The Scriptorium of the Mercian Rushworth Gloss: A Bilingual Perspective', *Notes and Queries*, 242: 453–59
- Coetsem, Frans van. 1988. *Loan Phonology and the Two Transfer Types in Language Contact*, *Publications in Language Sciences*, 27 (Dordrecht: Foris)
- Coleman, Julie. 1999. *Love, Sex and Marriage: A Historical Thesaurus*, Costerus, n.s., 118 (Amsterdam: Rodopi)
- Coleman, Robert. 1992. 'Italic', in *Indo-European Numerals*, ed. by Jadranka Gvozdanović, *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs*, 57 (Berlin: Gruyter), pp. 389–445
- Colgrave, Bertram, and Ann Hyde. 1962. 'Two Recently Discovered Leaves from Old English Manuscripts', *Speculum*, 37: 60–78
- Collinge, N. E. 1985. *The Laws of Indo-European*, *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science*, Series 4: *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 35 (Amsterdam: Benjamins)
- Colman, Fran. 1994. 'On the Morphology of Old English Word Stress', *Lingua*, 93: 141–81
- Colman, Rebecca V. 1981. 'Hamsocn: Its Meaning and Significance in Early English Law', *American Journal of Legal History*, 25: 95–110
- , 1985. 'Domestic Peace and Public Order in Anglo-Saxon Law', in *The Anglo-Saxons: Synthesis and Achievement*, ed. by J. Douglas Woods and David A. E. Pelteret (Waterloo, ON: Wilfrid Laurier University Press), pp. 49–61
- Conner, Patrick W. (ed.). 1996. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, x: *The Abingdon Chronicle, A.D. 956–1066 (MS. C, with Reference to BDE)* (Cambridge: Brewer)
- Cooke, Jessica. 1993. 'The Harley Manuscript 3376: A Study in Anglo-Saxon Glosso-graphy' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge)

- , 1997. 'Worcester Books and Scholars, and the Making of the Harley Glossary (British Library MS. Harley 3376)', *Anglia*, 115: 441–68
- Cormack, W. F. 2000. 'Drengs and Drings', *Transactions of the Dumfriesshire and Galloway Natural History and Antiquarian Society*, 3rd ser., 74: 61–67
- Cornelius, Regina (ed.). 1995. *Die altenglische Interlinearversion zu 'De vitiis et peccatis' in der Hs. British Library, Royal 7 C.iv*, Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reich 4: Angelsächsische Sprache und Literatur, 296 (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang)
- Crane, Susan. 1999. 'Anglo-Norman Cultures in England, 1066–1460', in *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, ed. by David Wallace (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 35–60
- Craster, Edmund. 1954. 'The Patrimony of St Cuthbert', *English Historical Review*, 69: 177–99
- Croft, William, and D. Alan Cruse. 2004. *Cognitive Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Cronan, Dennis. 2004. 'Poetic Words, Conservatism and the Dating of Old English Poetry', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 33: 23–50
- Cross, Samuel H. 1935. 'Medieval Russian Contacts with the West', *Speculum*, 10: 137–44
- Cubbin, G. P. (ed.). 1996. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, VI: *MS D: A Semi-Diplomatic Edition with Introduction and Indices* (Cambridge: Brewer)
- Cullen, Paul, and others. 2011. *Thorps in a Changing Landscape*, Explorations in Local and Regional History, 4 (Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press)
- Cummings, Michael J. 1979. 'Napier Homily 55 and Belfour Homily 10 on the Temptations in the Desert', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 80: 315–24
- Curzan, Anne. 2003. *Gender Shifts in the History of English*, Studies in English Language (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Dance, Richard. 1999. 'The Battle of Maldon Line 91 and the Origins of Call: A Reconsideration', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 100: 143–54
- , 2000. 'Is the Verb *die* Derived from Old Norse? A Review of the Evidence', *English Studies*, 81: 368–83
- , 2003. *Words Derived from Old Norse in Early Middle English: Studies in the Vocabulary of the South-West Midland Texts*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 246 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies)
- , 2004. 'North Sea Currents: Old English-Old Norse Relations, Literary and Linguistic', *Literary Compass*, 1, ME 117: 1–10
- , 2011. '"Tomorȝan hit is awane": Words Derived from Old Norse in Four Lambeth Homilies', in *Foreign Influences on Medieval English*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak and Magdalena Bator, Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature, 28 (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang), pp. 77–127
- , 2012. 'English in Contact: Norse', in *English Historical Linguistics: An International Handbook*, II, ed. by Alexander Bergs and Laurel J. Brinton, Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science, 34.2 (Berlin: de Gruyter), pp. 1724–37
- , 2013. '"Tor for to telle": Words Derived from Old Norse in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*', in *Multilingualism in Medieval Britain (c. 1066–1520)*, ed. by Judith A.

- Jefferson and Ad Putter (with the assistance of Amanda Hopkins), *Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe*, 15 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 41–58
- , Forthcoming a. 'Ealde æ, niwe laze: Two Words for "Law" in the Twelfth Century (with an appendix by Richard Dance and Aidan Conti)', *New Medieval Literatures*, 13
- , Forthcoming b. *Words Derived from Old Norse in 'Sir Gawain and the Green Knight': An Etymological Survey*
- Danchev, Andrei. 1986. 'Interlanguage Simplification in Middle English Vowel Phonology?', in *Linguistics across Historical and Geographical Boundaries in Honour of Jacek Fisiak*, ed. by Dieter Kastovsky and Aleksander Szwedek, *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs*, 32, 2 vols (Den Haag: Gruyter), 1: *Linguistic Theory and Historical Linguistics*, pp. 239–52
- , 1997. 'The Middle English Creolization Hypothesis Revisited', in *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs*, 103 (Berlin: Gruyter, 1997), pp. 79–108
- Danet, Brenda, and Bryna Bogoch. 1992. 'From Oral Ceremony to Written Document: The Transitional Language of Anglo-Saxon Wills', *Language and Communication*, 12: 95–122
- Darlington, R. R., and others (eds and trans.). 1995–98. *The Chronicle of John of Worcester*, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Davidson, James B. 1883. 'On Some Anglo-Saxon Charters at Exeter', *Journal of the British Archaeological Association*, 39: 259–303
- Davis, H. W. C., and others (eds). 1913. *Regesta Regum Anglo-Normannorum 1066–1154*, 4 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913–69), 1: *Regesta Willelmi Conquestoris et Willelmi Rufi*
- Davis, R. H. C. 1991. 'Alfred and Guthrum's Frontier', in *From Alfred the Great to Stephen*, by R. H. C. Davis (London: Hambledon), pp. 47–54 (first publ. in *English Historical Review*, 97 (1982): 803–10)
- Denison, David. 1981. 'Aspects of the History of English Group-Verbs, with Particular Attention to the Syntax of the *Ormulum*' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford)
- , 1985. 'The Origins of Completive *up* in English', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 86: 37–61
- Denison, David, and Richard Hogg. 2006. 'Overview', in *A History of the English Language*, ed. by Richard Hogg and David Denison (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 1–42
- Dennis, Andrew, and others (trans.). 1980–2000. *Laws of Early Iceland: Grágás: The Codex Regius with Material from Other Manuscripts*, University of Manitoba Press Icelandic Studies, 3 and 5, 2 vols (Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press)
- Deroy, Louis. 1980. *L'emprunt linguistique*, Bibliothèque de la Faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'Université de Liège, 141, 2nd edn (Paris: Belles Lettres)
- [DGL = ] *Danmarks gamle landskabslove med kirkelovene*, ed. by Johannes Brøndum-Nielsen and others, 8 vols (København: Gyldendal, 1933–61)
- Diamond, Robert E. 1963. *The Diction of the Anglo-Saxon Metrical Psalms*, *Janua Linguarum: Series Practica*, 10 (Den Haag: Mouton)



- Dickins, Bruce. 1950. 'The Beheaded Manumission in the Exeter Book', in *The Early Cultures of North-West Europe* (H. M. Chadwick Memorial Studies), ed. by Cyril Fox and Bruce Dickins (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 363–67
- Dieth, E. 1955. 'Hips: A Geographical Contribution to the 'she' Puzzle', *English Studies*, 36: 209–17
- Di Sciacca, Claudia. 2012. 'For Heaven's Sake: The Scandinavian Contribution to a Semantic Field in Old and Middle English', in *Language Contact and Development around the North Sea*, ed. by Merja Stenroos and others, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 321 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins), pp. 169–92
- [DMLBS =] *Dictionary of Medieval Latin from British Sources*, ed. by R. E. Latham and others, 15 fascicules to date (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975–)
- Doane, A. N. 1978. *Genesis A: A New Edition* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press)
- Doble, Gilbert H. S. 1929. *Neot: Patron of St. Neot, Cornwall, and St. Neot's, Huntingdonshire*, Cornish Saints, 21 (Exeter: Sydney Lee)
- Dobson, Eric John. 1976. *The Origins of Ancrène Wisse* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- [DOE =] *Dictionary of Old English*, ed. by Ashley Crabdel Amos and others, 8 vols to date (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, University of Toronto, 1986–)
- Dominique, Nicole Z. 1977. 'Middle English: Another Creole?', *Journal of Creole Studies*, 1: 89–100
- Douglas, D. C. 1928. 'Fragments of an Anglo-Saxon Survey from Bury St Edmunds', *English Historical Review*, 43: 376–83
- , 1932. *Feudal Documents from the Abbey of Bury St Edmunds*, The British Academy Records of the Social and Economic History of England and Wales, 8 (London: Humphrey Milford)
- Downer, L. J. (ed. and trans.). 1972. *Leges Henrici Primi* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Drago, Adriana. 1977. 'Le glosse anglosassoni del *Durham Ritual*', in *Studi di filologia e di letteratura tedesca in onore di Nicola Accolti Gil Vitale*, ed. by Giancarlo Bolognesi and Giorgio Sichel (Firenze: Olschki), pp. 35–62
- Drew, Katherine Fischer (trans.). 1991. *The Laws of the Salian Franks*, University of Pennsylvania Press Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press)
- Dronke, Ursula (ed.). 1997. *The Poetic Edda*, 3 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1969–2011), II: *Mythological Poems* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Drout, Michael D. C. 2004. 'Re-Dating the Old English Translation of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang: The Evidence of the Prose Style', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 103: 341–68
- , 2006. *How Tradition Works: A Meme-Based Cultural Poetics of the Anglo-Saxon Tenth Century*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 306 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies)
- Duczko, Wladyslaw. 2004. *Viking Rus: Studies on the Presence of Scandinavians in Eastern Europe* (Leiden: Brill)
- Dudley, Louise. 1914. 'The Grave', *Modern Philology*, 11: 429–42
- Dumville, David N. 1983. 'Some Aspects of Annalistic Writing at Canterbury in the Eleventh and Early Twelfth Centuries', *Peritia*, 2: 23–57

- , 1992a. 'The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the Origins of English Square Minuscul Script', in *Wessex and England from Alfred to Edgar: Six Essays on Political, Cultural, and Ecclesiastical Revival*, by David N. Dumville, *Studies in Anglo-Saxon History*, 3 (Woodbridge: Boydell), pp. 55–139
- , 1992b. 'The Treaty of Alfred and Guthrum', in *Wessex and England from Alfred to Edgar: Six Essays on Political, Cultural, and Ecclesiastical Revival*, by David N. Dumville, *Studies in Anglo-Saxon History*, 3 (Woodbridge: Boydell), pp. 1–14
- Dunning, T. P., and Alan J. Bliss (eds). 1969. *The Wanderer*, Methuen Old English Library (London: Methuen)
- Durkin, Philip. 2009. *The Oxford Guide to Etymology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Earle, John. 1888. *A Hand-Book to the Land-Charters and Other Saxon Documents* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Eckhardt, Karl August (ed.). 1969. *Lex Salica, Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Legum Section I, II.2 (Hannover: Hahn)
- [EDD =] *The English Dialect Dictionary*, ed. by Joseph Wright, 6 vols (London: Frowde, 1898–1905)
- Edwards, Heather. 1988. *The Charters of the Early West Saxon Kingdom*, BAR British Series, 198 (London: BAR)
- Ehwald, Rudolph (ed.) 1961. *Aldhelmi Opera*, in *Monumenta Germaniae Historica: Auctores antiquissimi* (Berlin: Weidmanns), xv
- Einarsson, Stefán. 1938. 'Two Scandinavianisms in the *Peterborough Chronicle*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 37: 18–20
- Ekwall, Eilert. 1935–36. 'Some Notes on English Place-Names Containing Names of Heathen Deities', *Englische Studien*, 70: 55–59
- , 1943. 'Old English ambyrne wind', in *Mélanges de philologie offerts à M. Johan Melander* (Uppsala: Lundequistska bokhandeln), pp. 275–84
- Electronic Sawyer*: see P. Sawyer 1968
- Elmevik, Lennart. 1998. 'Runeninschriften als Quelle der Sprachgeschichte zur Wikingerzeit', in *Runeninschriften als Quellen interdisziplinärer Forschung: Abhandlungen des Vierten internationalen Symposiums über Runen und Runeninschriften in Göttingen vom 4.–9. August 1995*, ed. by Klaus Düwel, *Ergänzungsbände zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, 15 (Berlin: Gruyter), pp. 583–91
- Engeler, Sigrid. 1991. *Altnordische Geldwörter: eine philologische Untersuchung altnordischer Geld- und Münzbezeichnungen und deren Verwendung in der Dichtung*, Germanistische Arbeiten zu Sprache und Kulturgeschichte, 16 (Frankfurt: Lang)
- English, Barbara. 1979. *The Lords of Holderness 1086–1260: A Study in Feudal Society* (New York: Oxford University Press)
- Evans, Jonathan. 2000. 'Scribal Error as Linguistic Evidence in the *Peterborough Chronicle*: Anglo-Scand./eME *þeora*', *North-Western European Language Evolution*, 37: 53–122
- Faarlund, Jan Terje. 1975. 'Monoftongering i nordisk', *Maal og Minne*, 3/4: 169–89
- , 1994. 'Old and Middle Scandinavian', in *The Germanic Languages*, ed. by Ekkehard König and Johan van der Auwera, *Routledge Language Family Descriptions* (London: Routledge), pp. 38–71



- , 2004. *The Syntax of Old Norse with a Survey of Inflectional Morphology and a Complete Bibliography* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Falk, Hjalmar. 1912. 'Altnordisches Seewesen', *Wörter und Sachen*, 4: 1–122
- Falk, Hjalmar, and Alf Torp (eds). 1910–11. *Norwegisch-Dänisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols (Heidelberg: Winter)
- Faull, Margaret L., and Marie Stinson (eds). 1986. *Domesday Book*, xxx: *Yorkshire* (Chichester: Phillimore)
- Fehr, Bernhard (ed.). 1966. *Die Hirtenbriefe Ælfrics in altenglischer und lateinischer Fassung*, with a supplement to the introduction by Peter Clemoes, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, 9 (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft; first publ. Hamburg: Grand, 1914)
- Fell, Christine. 1982–85. 'Unfrið: An Approach to a Definition', *Saga-Book of the Viking Society*, 21: 85–100
- , 1984a. 'Some Questions of Language', in *Two Voyagers at the Court of King Alfred: The Ventures of Ohthere and Wulfstan together with the Description of Northern Europe from the Old English Orosius*, ed. by Niels Lund (York: Sessions), pp. 56–63
- , 1984b. *Women in Anglo-Saxon England* (London: British Museum)
- , 1986. 'Old English wicing: A Question of Semantics', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 72: 295–316
- , 1987. 'Modern English viking', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s., 18: 111–22
- , 2002. 'Words and Women in Anglo-Saxon England', in *'Lastworda betst': Essays in Memory of Christine E. Fell with her Unpublished Writings*, ed. by Carole Hough and Kathryn A. Lowe (Donington: Tyas), pp. 198–215
- Fellows-Jensen, Gillian. 1968. *Scandinavian Personal Names in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire*, Navnestudier, 7 (København: Akademisk)
- , 1984. 'Viking Settlement in the Northern and Western Isles — The Place-Name Evidence as Seen from Denmark and the Danelaw', in *The Northern and Western Isles in the Viking World: Survival, Continuity and Change*, ed. by Alexander Fenton and Hermann Pálsson (Edinburgh: Donald), pp. 148–68
- , 1987. 'The Vikings' Relationship with Christianity in the British Isles: The Evidence of Place-Names Containing the Element *kirkja*', in *Proceedings of the Tenth Viking Congress: Larkollen, Norway, 1985*, ed. by James E. Knirk, Universitets oldsaksamlings skrifter, n.s., 9 (Oslo: Universitets oldsaksamling), pp. 295–307
- , 1989. 'Amounderness and Holderness', in *Studia Onomastica: Festschrift till Thorsten Andersson den 23 Februari 1989, with English Summaries*, ed. by Lena Peterson and Svante Strandberg (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell), pp. 57–94
- Feulner, Anna Helene. 2000. *Die griechischen Lehnwörter im Altenglischen*, Münchener Universitäts-Schriften, 21 (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang)
- Fidjestøl, Bjarne. 1999. *The Dating of Eddic Poetry: A Historical Survey and Methodological Investigation*, ed. by Odd Einar Haugen, Bibliotheca Arnarnagana, 41 (København: Reitzel)
- Finberg, H. P. R. 1961. *The Early Charters of the West Midlands*, Studies in Early English History, 2 (Leicester: Leicester University Press)

- , 1964. *Early Charters of Wessex*, Studies in Early English History, 3 (Leicester: Leicester University Press)
- Fischer, Andreas. 1986. *Engagement, Wedding and Marriage in Old English*, Anglistische Forschungen, 176 (Heidelberg: Winter)
- , 1989. 'Lexical Change in Late Old English: From *ǣ* to *lagu*', in *The History and the Dialects of English: Festschrift for Eduard Kolb*, ed. by Andreas Fischer, Anglistische Forschungen, 203 (Heidelberg: Winter), pp. 103–14
- , 1996. 'The Vocabulary of Very Late Old English', in *Studies in English Language and Literature: 'Doubt Wisely': Papers in Honour of E.G. Stanley*, ed. by M. J. Toswell and E. M. Tyler (London: Routledge), pp. 29–41
- , 2000. 'Lexical Gaps, Cognition and Linguistic Change', in *Lexicology, Semantics and Lexicography: Selected Papers from the Fourth G.L. Brook Symposium, Manchester, August, 1998*, ed. by Julie Coleman (Philadelphia: Benjamins), pp. 1–18
- , 2003. 'Lexical Borrowing and the History of English: A Typology of Typologies', in *Language Contact in the History of English*, ed. by Dieter Kastovsky and Arthur Mettinger, Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature, 1, 2nd edn (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang), pp. 97–115
- , 2004. 'The Notional Structure of Thesauruses', in *Categorization in the History of English*, ed. by Christian Kay and Jeremy Smith, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 261 (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2004), pp. 41–58
- Fischer, Frank. 1909. *Die Lehnwörter des Altwestnordischen*, Palaestra, 85 (Berlin: Mayer & Müller)
- Fisiak, Jacek. 2001. 'Old East Anglian: A Problem in Old English Dialectology', in *East Anglian English*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak and Peter Trudgill (Cambridge: Brewer), pp. 13–38
- Fladby, Ralf. 1956. 'Attung', *Kulturbistorisk leksikon for nordisk middelalder*, ed. by John Danstrup and others, 22 vols (København: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1956–82), 1: *Abbed-Blide*, pp. 276–78
- Flasdieck, H. M. 1935. 'Untersuchungen über die germanischen schwachen Verben III. Klasse (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des Altenglischen)', *Anglia*, 59: 1–192
- Flint, V. I. J. 1995. *Honorius Augustodunensis of Regensburg*, Authors of the Middle Ages, 6 (Aldershot: Variorum)
- Flom, George Tobias. 1900. *Scandinavian Influence on Southern Lowland Scotch: A Contribution of the Linguistic Relations of English and Scandinavian*, Columbia University Germanic Studies, 1 (New York: [n. pub.])
- Förster, Max T. W. 1901. 'Two Notes on Old English Dialogue Literature', in *An English Miscellany Presented to Dr. Furnivall in Honour of his Seventy-Fifth Birthday* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp. 86–106
- , 1903. 'Der Kleinliteratur des Aberglaubens im Altenglischen', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 110: 346–58
- , 1913. 'Der Vercelli Codex CXVII: nebst Abdruck einiger altenglischer Homilien der Handschrift', in *Festschrift für Lorenz Morsbach dargebracht von Freunden und Schülern*, ed. by F. Holthausen and H. Spies, Studien zur englischen Philologie, 50 (Halle: Niemeyer), pp. 20–179

- , 1920. 'Der Inhalt der altenglischen Handschrift Vespasianus D. XIV', *Englische Studien*, 54: 46–68
- , 1921. 'Keltisches Wortgut im Englischen', in *Texte und Forschungen zur englischen Kulturgeschichte: Festgabe für Felix Liebermann zum 20. Juli 1921* (Halle: Niemeyer), pp. 119–242
- , 1925a. 'Die Legende vom Trinubium der hl. Anna', in *Probleme der englischen Sprache und Kultur: Festschrift Johannes Hoops zum 60. Geburtstag überreicht von Freunden und Kollegen*, ed. by Wolfgang Keller, Germanische Bibliothek, 2nd section: Untersuchungen und Texten, 20 (Heidelberg: Winter), pp. 105–30
- , 1925b. 'Die spätaltenglische Übersetzung der Pseudo-Anselmschen Marienpredigt', in *Anglica: Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie: Alois Brandl zum siebenzigsten Geburtstage überreicht*, Palaestra, 147–48, 2 vols (Leipzig: Mayer & Müller, 1925), II: *Literaturgeschichte*, pp. 8–69
- , 1930. 'Die Freilassungsurkunden des Bodmin-Evangeliars', in *A Grammatical Miscellany Offered to Otto Jespersen on his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. by Niels Bøgholm and others (København: Levin & Munksgaard; London: Allen & Unwin), pp. 77–99
- , 1932a. 'Abt Raoul d'Escures und der spätae. "Sermo in Festis S. Marie"', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 162: 43–48
- , (ed.). 1932b. *Die Vercelli-Homilien*, Bibliothek der angelsächsischen Prosa, 12 (Hamburg: Grand)
- , 1933a. 'Donations of Leofric to Exeter', in *The Exeter Book of Old English Poetry*, with Introductory Chapters by R. W. Chambers, Max Förster and Robin Flower (London: Lund, Humphries), pp. 10–32
- , 1933b. 'The Preliminary Matter of the Exeter Book', in *The Exeter Book of Old English Poetry*, with Introductory Chapters by R. W. Chambers, Max Förster and Robin Flower (London: Lund, Humphries), pp. 44–54
- , 1941. 'Die spätae. Deiktische Pronominalform *þege* und ne. *they*', *Bleibatt zur Anglia*, 52: 274–80
- , 1942. 'Nochmals ae. *þege*', *Bleibatt zur Anglia*, 53: 86–87
- Förster, Max, and A. S. Napier. 1906. 'Englische Cato- und Ilias-Glossen des 12. Jahrhunderts', *Archiv*, 117: 17–28
- Forston, Benjamin W. 2004. *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction* (Oxford: Blackwell)
- Fowler, J. T. (ed.). 1882. *Memorials of the Church of SS. Peter and Wilfrid, Ripon*, I, Publications of the Surtees Society, 74 (Durham: Andrews)
- Frank, Roberta. 1994. 'King Cnut in the Verse of his Skalds', in *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark and Norway*, ed. by Alexander R. Rumble, Studies in the Early History of England (London: Leicester University Press), pp. 106–24
- , 2007. 'Terminally Hip and Incredibly Cool: Carol, Vikings, and Anglo-Scandinavian England', *Representations*, 100: 23–33
- Frankis, John. 2004. 'Layamon and the Fortunes of Yogh', *Medium Ævum*, 73: 1–9
- Friel, Ian. 1995. *The Good Ship: Ships, Shipbuilding and Technology in England 1200–1520* (London: British Museum)

- Fritzner, Johan (ed.). 1972. *Ordbog over det gamle norske sprog*, 2nd edn with corrections and appendix by Finn Hødnebo, 3 vols (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget)
- Galbraith, V. H. 1920. 'Royal Charters to Winchester', *English Historical Review*, 35: 382–400
- Gammeltoft, Peder. 2001. "'I sauh a tour on a toft, tryelyche i-maket': On Place-Names in -toft, -tote and -tobhta from Shetland to the Isle of Man', *Nomina*, 24: 17–32
- , 2003. "'I sauh a tour on a toft, tryelyche i-maket', Part Two: On Place-Names in -toft in England', *Nomina*, 26: 43–63
- , 2004. 'Scandinavian Gaelic-Contacts. Can Place-Names and Place-Name Elements Be Used as a Source for Contact-Linguistic Research?', *North-Western European Language Evolution*, 44: 51–90
- Gardiner, Mark. 1999. 'Shipping and Trade between England and the Continent during the Eleventh Century', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 22: 71–93
- Gardner, Thomas. 1969. 'The Old English Kenning: A Characteristic of Germanic Poetical Diction?', *Modern Philology*, 67: 109–16
- Garmonsway, G. N. (ed.). 1978. *Ælfric's Colloquy*, rev. edn (Exeter: University of Exeter)
- Geeraerts, Dirk, and others. 1994. *The Structure of Lexical Variation: Meaning, Naming and Context*, Cognitive Linguistic Research, 5 (Berlin: Gruyter)
- Geipel, John. 1971. *The Viking Legacy: The Scandinavian Influence on the English and Gaelic Languages* (Newton Abbot: David & Charles)
- Gelling, Margaret. 1992. *The West Midlands in the Early Middle Ages*, Studies in the Early History of Britain (Leicester: Leicester University Press)
- Gillingham, John. 1995. 'Thegns and Knights in Eleventh-Century England: Who Was Then the Gentleman?', *Transactions of the Royal Historical Society*, 6th ser., 5: 129–53
- Gneuss, Helmut. 1955. *Lehnbildungen und Lehnbedeutungen im Altenglischen* (Berlin: Schmidt)
- , 1996. 'Die Battle of Maldon als historisches und literarisches Zeugnis', in Helmut Gneuss, *Language and History in Early England* (Aldershot: Variorum), no. ix (first publ. in *Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, Sitzungsberichte*, 5 (1976): 3–68)
- , 1997. 'Origin and Provenance of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: The Case of Cotton Tiberius A.III', in *Of the Making of Books: Medieval Manuscripts, their Scribes and Readers: Essays Presented to M. B. Parkes*, ed. by P. R. Robinson and Rivkah Zim (Aldershot: Scolar), pp. 13–48
- , 2001. *Handlist of Anglo-Saxon Manuscripts: A List of Manuscripts and Manuscript Fragments Written or Owned in England up to 1100*, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 241 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies)
- Godden, Malcolm R. 1975. 'Old English Composite Homilies from Winchester', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 4: 57–65
- , 1980. 'Ælfric's Changing Vocabulary', *English Studies*, 61: 206–23
- , 2000. *Ælfric's Catholic Homilies: Introduction, Commentary and Glossary*, Early English Text Society, s.s., 18 (Oxford: Oxford University Press)

- , 2004. 'The Relations of Wulfstan and Ælfric: A Reassessment', in *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, ed. by Matthew Townend, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 10 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 353–74
- Godden, Malcolm R., and Susan Irvine (eds). 2009. *The Old English Boethius: An Edition of the Old English Versions of Boethius's 'De consolazione philosophiae'*, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Göhler, Theodor. 1933. *Lautlehre der ae. Hexameron-Homilie des Abtes Ælfric* (Weida i. Thür: Thomas & Hubert)
- Goody, Jack. 1983. *The Development of the Family and Marriage in Europe* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Goolden, Peter (ed.). 1958. *The Old English Apollonius of Tyre*, Oxford English Monographs (London: Oxford University Press)
- Goossens, Louis (ed.). 1974. *The Old English Glosses of MS. Brussels, Royal Library, 1650 (Aldhelm's 'De laudibus virginitatis')*, Verhandelingen van de Koninklijke Akademie voor Wetenschappen, Letteren en Schone Kunsten van België, Klasse der Letteren, 74 (Brussels: AWLSK)
- Gordon, E. V. (ed.). 1937. *The Battle of Maldon*, Methuen's Old English Library (London: Methuen)
- , 1957. *An Introduction to Old Norse*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Görlach, Manfred. 1974. *The Textual Tradition of the South English Legendary*, Leeds Texts and Monographs, n.s., 6 (Leeds: University of Leeds School of English)
- , 1986. 'Middle English – A Creole?', in *Linguistics across Historical and Geographical Boundaries in Honour of Jacek Fisiak*, ed. by Dieter Kastovsky and Aleksander Szwedek, Linguistic Theory and Historical Linguistics, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 32, 2 vols (Den Haag: Gruyter), 1: *Linguistic Theory and Historical Linguistics* (Den Haag: Mouton de Gruyter), pp. 329–44
- Gramm, Willi. 1938. *Die Körperpflege der Angelsachsen: eine kulturgeschichtlich-etymologische Untersuchung*, Anglistische Forschungen, 86 (Heidelberg: Winter)
- Gretsch, Mechthild. 1978. 'Die Winteney-Version der *Regula Sancti Benedicti*: eine frühmittelenglische Bearbeitung der altenglischen Prosäübersetzung der Benediktinerregel', *Anglia*, 96: 310–48
- , 1999. *The Intellectual Foundations of the English Benedictine Reform*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 25 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- , 2001. 'Winchester Vocabulary and Standard Old English: The Vernacular in Late Anglo-Saxon England', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library of Manchester*, 83.1: 41–87
- , 2004. 'The Taunton Fragment: A New Text from Anglo-Saxon England', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 33: 145–93
- Griepentrog, Wolfgang. 1995. *Die Wurzelnomina des germanischen und ihre Vorgeschichte*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 82 (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft)
- Griffith, Mark. 1992. 'Riddle 19 of the Exeter Book: Snac, an Old English Acronym', *Notes and Queries*, 237: 15–16
- , 1993. 'Convention and Originality in the Old English "Beasts of Battle" Typescene', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 22: 179–99



- , 1998. 'Dialect and Literary Dialect in the *Battle of Maldon*', *Notes and Queries*, 243: 272–73
- Griffiths, Bill (trans. and ed.). 1993. *The Battle of Maldon: Text and Translation* (Pinner: Anglo-Saxon Books)
- Grinda, Klaus R. 1966. Review of *The Phoenix*, ed. by N. F. Blake, *Anglia*, 84: 411–16
- Grondelaers, Stefan, and Dirk Geeraerts. 2003. 'Towards a Pragmatic Model of Cognitive Onomasiology', in *Cognitive Approaches to Lexical Semantics*, ed. by Hubert Cuyckens and others, *Cognitive Linguistic Research*, 23 (Berlin: Gruyter), pp. 67–92
- Grønvik, Ottar. 1982. 'The Words for "Heir", "Inheritance" and "Funeral Feast" in Early Germanic: An Etymological Study of ON *arfr* m., *arfi* m., *erfi* n., *erfa* vb and the Corresponding Words in the Older Germanic Dialects', *Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi: Hist.-Filos. Klasse: Avhandlinger*, n.s., 18: 4–25
- Guntermann, K. 1910. *Herrschaftliche und genossenschaftliche Termini (für Gott, Christus, den Teufel und ihre Umgebung) in der geistlichen Epik der Germanen* (Kiel: Lüddens & Haase)
- Gustavson, Helmer. 2003. 'Oklundainskriften sjuttio år efteråt', in *Runica – Germanica – Mediaevalia*, ed. by Wilhelm Heizmann and Astrid van Nahl (Berlin: Gruyter), pp. 186–98
- Gwara, Scott (ed.). 2001. *Aldhelmi Malmesbiriensis Prosa de virginitate cum Glosa Latina atque Anglosaxonica*, *Corpus Christianorum*, series latina, 124 and 124a, 2 vols (Turnhout: Brepols)
- Hadley, Dawn M. 1997. "And They Proceeded to Plough and Support Themselves": The Scandinavian Settlement in England', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 19: 69–96
- , 2000a. 'Hamlet and the Princes of Denmark: Lordship in the Danelaw, c. 860–954', in *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, ed. by Dawn M. Hadley and Julian D. Richards, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages*, 2 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 107–32
- , 2000b. *The Northern Danelaw: Its Social Structure, c. 800–1100* (London: Leicester University Press)
- , 2002. 'Viking and Native: Re-Thinking Identity in the Danelaw', *Early Medieval Europe*, 11: 45–70
- , 2006. *The Vikings in England: Settlement, Society and Culture*, *Manchester Medieval Studies* (Manchester: Manchester University Press)
- Hafström, Gerhard. 1962. 'Hundare', *Kulturhistorisk leksikon for nordisk middelalder*, ed. by John Danstrup and others, 22 vols (København: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1956–82), VII: *Hovedstad-Judarård*, pp. 74–78
- Hahn, Thomas. 1999. 'Early Middle English', in *The Cambridge History of Medieval English Literature*, ed. by David Wallace (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 60–91
- Haigh, D. H. 1879. 'Yorkshire Dials', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 5: 134–222
- Hale, William Charles. 1978. 'An Edition and Codicological Study of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge MS 214' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Pennsylvania)

- Hall, Richard A. 2001. 'Anglo-Saxon and Viking-Age York', in *The History of York, Yorkshire: From the Earliest Times to the Year 2000*, ed. by Patrick Nuttgens (Pickering: Blackthorn), pp. 39–67
- Hall, Thomas N. 2002. 'The Earliest Anglo-Latin Text of the Trinubium Annae (BHL 505zl)', in *Via Crucis: Essays on Early Medieval Sources and Ideas in Memory of J. E. Cross*, ed. by Thomas N. Hall and others, *Medieval European Studies*, 1 (Morgantown: West Virginia University Press), pp. 104–37
- Hallinder, Pär. 1986. 'Streit- und Arbeitsäxte', in *Birka*, ed. by Greta Arwidsson and others (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1943–85), 11.2: *Systematische Analysen der Gräberfunde*, ed. by Greta Arwidsson, pp. 45–50
- Hameyer, Klaus. 1979. 'Determining the Linguistic Variables of Interdialectal Intelligibility', *Lingua*, 49: 283–93
- Handley, Rima. 1984. 'British Museum MS. Cotton Vespasian D.xiv', *Notes and Queries*, 219: 243–50
- , 1985. 'A Study of the Twelfth-Century Manuscript, British Museum Cotton Vespasian D.xiv, Based on Editions of Selected Non-Ælfrician Texts' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford)
- Hansen, Bente Hyldegaard. 1984. 'The Historical Implications of the Scandinavian Element in English: A Theoretical Evaluation', *North-Western European Language Evolution*, 4: 53–95
- Hargreaves, Henry, and Cecily Clark. 1965. 'An Unpublished Old English Psalter-Gloss Fragment', *Notes and Queries*, 210: 443–46
- Harmer, Florence E. 1959. 'A Bromfield and a Coventry Writ of King Edward the Confessor', in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of their History and Culture Presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. by Peter Clemoes (London: Bowes and Bowes), pp. 89–103
- , (ed.). 1989. *Anglo-Saxon Writs*, Paul Watkins Medieval Studies, 2, 2nd edn (Stamford: Watkins)
- Harris, Joseph. 1986. "'Brunanburh" 12b-13a and Some Skaldic Passages', in *Magister Regis: Studies in Honour of Robert Earl Kaske*, ed. by Arthur Groos and others (New York: Fordham University Press), pp. 61–68
- , 1993. 'Love and Death in the Männerbund: An Essay with Special Reference to *Bjarkamál* and *The Battle of Maldon*', in *Heroic Poetry in the Anglo-Saxon Period: Studies in Honour of Jess B. Bessinger*, ed. by Helen Damico and John Leyerle, *Studies in Medieval Culture*, 32 (Kalamazoo: Medieval Institute, Western Michigan University), 77–114
- Hart, Cyril R. 1966. *Early Charters of Eastern England*, *Studies in Early English History*, 5 (Leicester: Leicester University Press)
- , 1975. *Early Charters of Northern England and the North Midlands*, *Studies in Early English History*, 6 (Leicester: Leicester University Press)
- , 1992. *The Danelaw* (London: Hambledon Press)
- , 1993. 'Essex in the Late Tenth Century', in *'The Battle of Maldon': Fiction and Fact*, ed. by Janet Cooper (London: Hambledon), pp. 171–204



- Harvey, P. D. A. 1993. 'Rectitudines Singularum Personarum and Gerefa', *English Historical Review*, 108: 1–22
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2008. 'Loanword Typology: Steps towards a Systematic Cross-Linguistic Study of Lexical Borrowability', in *Aspects of Language Contact: New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Findings with Special Focus on Romancisation Processes*, ed. by Thomas Stolz and others, Empirical Approaches to Language Typology, 35 (Berlin: Gruyter), pp. 43–62
- , 2009. 'Lexical Borrowing: Concepts and Issues', in *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, ed. by Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor (Den Haag: Mouton de Gruyter), pp. 35–54
- Haugen, Odd Einar. 1950a. 'The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing', *Language*, 26: 210–31
- , 1950b. *First Grammatical Treatise: The Earliest Germanic Phonology*, Language Monographs, 25 (Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America)
- , 1976. *The Scandinavian Languages: An Introduction to their History*, The Great Languages (London: Faber and Faber)
- , 1993. 'Dialects', in *Medieval Scandinavia: An Encyclopedia*, ed. by Phillip Pulsiano and others (London: Garland), pp. 130–34
- Hazeltine, H. D. 1930. 'General Preface', in *Anglo-Saxon Wills*, ed. and trans. by Dorothy Whitelock, Cambridge Studies in English Legal History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. vii–xl
- Heggstad, Leiv, and others. 1997. *Norrøn ordbok* (Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget)
- Heide, Eldar. 2002 [2003]. 'Stamnkarakteriserande sips- og båtnevnningar: knørr og geitbåt', *Norsk sjøfartsmuseum årbok*: 57–72
- , 2005. 'Viking – "Rower Shifting"?', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 120: 41–54
- , 2006. 'Rus "Eastern Viking" and the viking "Rower Shifting" Etymology', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 121: 75–77
- , 2008. 'Viking, Week, and Widsith: A Reply to Harald Bjorvand', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 123: 23–28
- Heidermanns, Frank. 1993. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der germanischen Primäradjektive*, Studia Linguistica Germanica, 33 (Berlin: Gruyter)
- Henderson, J. Frank. (1995). 'Feminizing the Rule of Benedict in Medieval England', *Magistra*, 1 (Summer): 9–38
- Heningham, Eleanor K. 1940. 'Old English Precursors of The Worcester Fragments', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 55: 291–307
- Hessels, J. H. (ed.). 1890. *An English Eighth-Century Latin-Anglo-Saxon Glossary* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Heusler, Andreas. 1950. *Altisländisches Elementarbuch*, 4th edn (Heidelberg: Winter)
- Higham, N. J. 1986. *The Northern Counties to AD 1000* (London: Longman)
- Hildebrandt, Reiner (ed.). 1974–95. *Summarium Heinrici*, Quellen und Forschungen zur Sprach- und Kulturgeschichte der germanischen Völker, n.s., 61, 78, and 109, 3 vols (Berlin: Gruyter)
- Hill, Betty. 1989. 'Seven Old English Glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels', *Notes and Queries*, 234: 148–50

- Hill, Joyce. 1998. 'Winchester Pedagogy and the Colloquy of Ælfric', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s., 29: 137–52
- Hines, John. 1984. *The Scandinavian Character of Anglian England in the Pre-Viking Period*, BAR British Series, 124 (Oxford: BAR)
- , 1991. 'Scandinavian English: A Creole in Context', in *Language Contact in the British Isles: Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium on Language Contact in Europe, Douglas, Isle of Man, 1988*, ed. by P. Sture Ureland and George Broderick, *Linguistische Arbeiten*, 238 (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 403–27
- Historical Thesaurus of the Oxford English Dictionary*. 2009. Ed. by Christian Kay and others, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009)
- Hjort, Peder. 1843. *Om det engelske Konjugationssystem, med en Tillæg om Forholdet imellem Dansk og Engelsk* (København: [n. pub.])
- Hoad, Terry F. 1984. 'English Etymology: Some Problematic Areas in the Vocabulary of the Middle English Period', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 27–57
- , 1993. 'On the Role of Some Questions of Semantics in Etymological Explanations', in *Current Trends in West Germanic Etymological Lexicography*, ed. by Rolf H. Bremmer and Jan van den Berg (Leiden: Brill), pp. 117–32
- Höfler, Otto. 1932. 'Altnordische Lehnwortstudien', *Archiv für nordisk filologi*, 3rd ser., 4: 212–41
- Hofmann, Dietrich. 1955. *Nordisch-englische Lehnbeziehungen der Wikingerzeit*, *Bibliotheca Arnemagnæana*, 14 (København: Munksgaard)
- , 1957. 'Untersuchungen zu den altenglischen Gedichten Genesis und Exodus', *Anglia*, 75: 1–34
- Hofstetter, Walter. 1987. *Winchester und der spätaltenglische Sprachgebrauch*, *Münchener Universitäts-Schriften*, 14 (München: Fink)
- , 1988. 'Winchester and the Standardization of Old English Vocabulary', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 17: 139–61
- Hogg, Richard M. 1988. 'On the Impossibility of Old English Dialectology', in *Luick Revisited: Papers Read at the Luick-Symposium at Schloß Liechtenstein, 15.–18. 9. 1985*, ed. by Dieter Kastovsky and others, *Tübinger Beiträge zur Linguistik*, 288 (Tübingen: Narr), pp. 183–203
- , 1992. *A Grammar of Old English*, 2 vols (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992–2011), 1: *Phonology*
- , 2004a. 'North Northumbrian and South Northumbrian: A Geographical Statement?', in *Methods and Data in English Historical Dialectology*, ed. by Marina Dossena and Roger Lass, *Linguistic Insights: Studies in Language and Communication*, 16 (Bern: Lang), pp. 241–55
- , 2004b. 'The Spread of Negative Constructions in Early English', in *Studies in the History of the English Language*, 11: *Unfolding Conversations*, ed. by Anne Curzan and Kimberly Emmons, *Topics in English Linguistics*, 45 (Berlin: Gruyter), pp. 459–82
- , 2006a. 'English in Britain', in *A History of the English Language*, ed. by Richard Hogg and David Denison (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 352–83
- , 2006b. 'Old English Dialectology', in *The Handbook of the History of English*, ed. by Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 395–416

- Holman, Katherine. 1996. *Scandinavian Runic Inscriptions in the British Isles: Their Historical Context*, Senter for middelalderstudier: Skrifter, 4 (Trondheim: Tapir)
- Holmberg, Bengt. 1946. *Tomt och toft som appellative och ortnamnselement*, Skriffter utgivna av Kungl. Gustav Adolfs Akademien, 17 (Uppsala: Appelberg)
- Holthausen, F. (ed.). 1934. *Altenglisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Germanische Bibliothek, 4th ser.: Wörterbücher, 7 (Heidelberg: Winter)
- , 1951. 'Beiträge zur englischen Etymologie', *Anglia*, 70: 1–21
- Hollis, Stephanie, and Michael Wright. 1992. *Old English Prose of Secular Learning*, Annotated Bibliographies of Old and Middle English Literature, 4 (Cambridge: Brewer)
- Hollister, C. Warren. 1962. *Anglo-Saxon Military Institutions on the Eve of the Norman Conquest* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Home, Malasree. 2005. 'The *Peterborough Chronicle* and the Writing of History in the Twelfth Century' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge)
- , 2010. 'Double-Edged déjà vu: The Complexity of the *Peterborough Chronicle*', in *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History*, ed. by Alice Jorgensen, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages*, 23 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 67–90
- Hooper, N. A. 1992a. 'The Housecarls in England in the Eleventh Century', in *Anglo-Norman Warfare: Studies in Late Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman Military Organization and Warfare*, ed. by Matthew Strickland (Woodbridge: Boydell), pp. 1–16 (first publ. in *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 7 (1984): 161–76)
- , 1992b. 'Some Observations on the Navy in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *Anglo-Norman Warfare: Studies in Late Anglo-Saxon and Anglo-Norman Military Organization and Warfare*, ed. by Matthew Strickland (Woodbridge: Boydell), pp. 17–27 (first publ. in *Studies in Medieval History Presented to R. Allen Brown*, ed. by Christopher Harper-Bill and others (Woodbridge: Boydell, 1989), pp. 203–13)
- , 1994. 'Military Developments in the Reign of Cnut', in *The Reign of Cnut: King of England, Denmark and Norway*, ed. by Alexander R. Rumble (London: Leicester University Press), pp. 89–100
- Horner, Shari. 2004. 'The Language of Rape in Old English Literature and Law: Views from the Anglo-Saxon(ist)s', in *Sex and Sexuality in Anglo-Saxon England: Essays in Memory of Daniel Gillmore Calder*, ed. by Carol Braun Pasternack and Lisa M. C. Weston, *Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies*, 277 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies), pp. 149–81
- Horobin, Simon. 2009. *Studying the History of Early English* (Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan)
- Horobin, Simon, and Jeremy Smith. 2002. *An Introduction to Middle English*, Edinburgh Textbooks in the English Language (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)
- Horstmann, C. (ed.). 1895–96. *Yorkshire Writers: Richard Rolle of Hampole and his Followers*, Library of Early English Writers, 1 and 2, 2 vols (London: Sonnenschein)
- Hough, Carole. 1995–96. 'Three Place-Name Compounds: OE *swinland*, OE *wiperstede* and OE *cēapland*', *Journal of the English Place-Name Society*, 28: 71–76
- , 1996. 'Old English *rōt* in Place-Names', *Notes and Queries*, 241: 128–29

- Houts, Elisabeth van. 2004. 'The Vocabulary of Exile and Outlawry in the North-Sea Area around the First Millennium', in *Exile in the Middle Ages: Selected Proceedings from the International Medieval Congress, University of Leeds, 8–11 July 2002*, ed. by Laura Napran and Elisabeth van Houts, International Medieval Research, 13 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 13–28
- Howe, Stephen. 1996. *The Personal Pronouns in the Germanic Languages: A Study of Personal Pronoun Morphology and Change in the Germanic Languages from the First Records to the Present Day*, Studia Linguistica Germanica, 43 (Berlin: Gruyter)
- Howell, Robert B., and Joseph C. Salmons. 1997. 'Umlautless Residues in Germanic', *American Journal of Germanic Linguistics and Literatures*, 9: 83–111
- Howorth, H. 1912. 'The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle, its Origins and History [Part III]', *Archaeological Journal*, 69: 312–70
- Hudson, Benjamin. 1994. 'Knútr and Viking Dublin', *Scandinavian Studies*, 66: 319–35
- Hug, Sibylle. 1987. *Scandinavian Loanwords and their Equivalents in Middle English*, European University Studies Series, 21: Linguistics, 62 (Berlin: Lang)
- Hurnard, Naomi D. 1949. 'The Anglo-Norman Franchises', *English Historical Review*, 64: 289–323 and 433–60
- Iglesias Rábade, Luis. 1991. 'French Colloquial Loan-Words in English Texts Prior to 1300: Semantic Analysis and Sociolinguistic Implications', *Atlantis*, 13.1–2: 51–63
- Inslay, Charles. 1998. 'Charters and Episcopal Scriptoria in the Anglo-Saxon South-West', *Early Medieval Europe*, 7: 173–97
- Irvine, Susan (ed.). 1993. *Old English Homilies from MS Bodley 343*, Early English Text Society, o.s., 302 (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- , 2000. 'The Compilation and Use of Manuscripts Containing Old English in the Twelfth Century', in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. by Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 30 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 41–61
- , (ed.). 2004. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, VII: *MS E* (Cambridge: Brewer)
- , 2010. 'The Production of the Peterborough Chronicle', in *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History*, ed. by Alice Jorgensen, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 23 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 49–66
- Irving, Edward B. 1959. 'On the Dating of the Old English Poems *Genesis* and *Exodus*', *Anglia*, 77: 1–11
- Isakson, Bo. 2000. 'The Emergence of a Scandinavian Language: Development until around 900', *North-Western European Language Evolution*, 36: 3–43
- Iverson, Gregory K., and Joseph C. Salmons. 2004. 'The Conundrum of Old Norse Umlaut: Sound Change versus Crisis Analogy', *Journal of Germanic Linguistics*, 16: 77–110
- Jacobsen, Lis, and Erik Moltke (eds). 1941–42. *Danmarks runeindskrifter* (København: Munksgaard)
- Jansson, Ingmar. 1988. 'Wikingerzeitlicher orientalischer Import in Skandinavien', in *Oldenburg, Wolin, Staraja Ladoga, Novgorod, Kiev: Handel und Handelsverbindungen*

- im südlichen und östlichen Ostseeraum während des frühen Mittelalters: Internationale Fachkonferenz der deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft vom 5.-9. Oktober 1987 in Kiel*, ed. by M. Müller-Wille, Bericht der römisch-germanischen Kommission, 69: 564–647
- Jansson, Sam Owen. 1968. 'Plogland', in *Kulturhistorisk leksikon for nordisk middelalder*, ed. by John Danstrup and others, 22 vols (København: Rosenkilde and Bagger, 1956–82), XIII: *Ormer-Regnbue*, p. 328
- Jansson, Sven B. F. (ed.). 1964. *Västmanlands runinskrifter*, Sveriges runinskrifter, 13 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell)
- Jesch, Judith. 1992. "'Good Men" and Peace in *Njáls saga*', in *Introductory Essays on 'Egils Saga' and 'Njáls Saga'*, ed. by John Hines and Desmond Slay (London: Viking Society for Northern Research), pp. 64–82
- , 1993. 'Skaldic Verse and Viking Semantics', in *Viking Revaluations: Viking Society Centenary Symposium 14–15 May 1992*, ed. by Anthony Faulkes and Richard Perkins (London: Viking Society for Northern Research), pp. 160–71
- , 1994. 'Skaldic and Runic Vocabulary and the Viking Age: A Research Project', in *The Twelfth Viking Congress: Developments around the Baltic and the North Sea in the Viking Age*, ed. by Björn Ambrosiani and Helen Clarke, Birka Studies, 3 (Stockholm: Birka Project), pp. 294–301
- , 2000. 'From Scandinavia to the Wirral', in *Wirral and its Viking Heritage*, ed. by Paul Cavill and others, English Place-Name Society, Popular Series, 2 (Nottingham: English Place-Name Society), pp. 11–16
- , 2001a. 'Eagles, Ravens and Wolves: Beasts of Battle, Symbols of Victory and Death', in *Scandinavians from the Vendel Period to Tenth Century*, ed. by Judith Jesch (Woodbridge: Boydell), pp. 251–71
- , 2001b. *Ships and Men in the Late Viking Age: The Vocabulary of Runic Inscriptions and Skaldic Verse* (Woodbridge: Boydell)
- , 2002. 'Old Norse *vikingr*: A Question of Contexts', in *'Lastworda betst': Essays in Memory of Christine E. Fell with her Unpublished Writings*, ed. by Carole Hough and Kathryn A. Lowe (Donington: Tyas), pp. 107–21
- , 2008. 'Scandinavian Women's Names in English Place-Names', in *A Commodity of Good Names: Essays in Honour of Margaret Gelling*, ed. by O. J. Padel and David N. Parsons (Donington: Tyas), pp. 154–62
- , 2009. 'Inscriptions and Identities in Scandinavian England', Paper Delivered at the Viking Identities Network IV: Language, Texts, and Gender in the Viking Diaspora, Leicester, 30–31 March 2009
- Jochens, Jenny. 2002. 'Vikings Westwards to Vinland: The Problem of Women', in *Cold Counsel: Women in Old Norse Literature and Mythology: A Collection of Essays*, ed. by Sarah M. Anderson and Karen Swenson (London: Routledge), pp. 129–58
- Jóhannesson, Alexander (ed.). 1956. *Isländisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Bern: Francke)
- Johansen, Jan Geir. 1994. 'The Cohesion of the Worcester Fragments', *Papers on Language and Literature*, 30: 157–68
- Jolliffe, J. E. A. 1926. 'Northumbrian Institutions', *English Historical Review*, 161: 1–42



- , 1947. *The Constitutional History of Medieval England*, 2nd edn (London: Black)
- Jones, Charles. 1987. *Grammatical Gender in English: 950 to 1250* (London: Croom Helm)
- Jones, Gwyn. 1984. *A History of the Vikings*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Jones, Richard, and others. 2009. 'Porps and the Open Fields', in *Torp son ortnam och bebyggelse: Konferensrapport, Tvärvetenskaplig torp-konferens Malmö, 25–27 april 2007*, ed. by Peder Dam and others (Lund: Media-Tryck, University of Lund), pp. 55–76
- Jónsson, Finnur (ed.). 1912. *Den norsk-islandske skjaldedigtning*, 1: 800–1200 (København: Gyldendal; Oslo: Nordisk)
- Jordan, Richard. 1906. *Eigentümlichkeiten des englischen Wortschatzes: eine Wortgeographie Untersuchung mit etymologischen Anmerkungen*, *Anglistische Forschungen*, 17 (Heidelberg: Winter)
- , 1907. Review of *Die Bildung der schwachen Verba im Altenglischen*, by Claus Schuldt (1905), and *Die Bildung des Adjektivs im Altenglischen*, by Eduard Schön (1905), *Beiblatt zur Anglia*, 18: 33–37
- , 1974. *Handbook of Middle English Grammar: Phonology*, trans. and rev. by Eugene Joseph Crook, *Janua Linguarum: Studia Memoriae Nicolai van Wijk Dedicata, Series Practica*, 218 (Den Haag: Mouton)
- Jost, Karl. 1927. 'Unechte Ælfricexte', *Anglia*, 51: 81–103 and 177–219
- , 1950. *Wulfstanstudien, Schweizer anglistische Arbeiten: Swiss Studies in English*, 23 (Bern: Francke)
- Jungner, Hugo, and Elisabeth Svärdström (eds). 1940–71. *Västergötlands runinskrifter, Sveriges runinskrifter*, 5 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell)
- Kabir, Ananya Jahanara. 2001. *Paradise, Death and Doomsday in Anglo-Saxon Literature*, *Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England*, 32 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Karg-Gasterstädt, Elisabeth, and others (eds). 1968–. *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch: Auf Grund der von Elias von Steinmeyer hinterlassen Sammlungen im Auftrag der Sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Leipzig*, 5 vols to date (Berlin: Akademie)
- Karker, Allan. 1993. 'Numerals', in *Medieval Scandinavia: An Encyclopedia*, ed. by Phillip Pulsiano and others (New York: Garland), pp. 440–41
- Kastovsky, Dieter. 1985. 'Deverbal Nouns in Old and Modern English: From Stem-Formation to Word-Formation', in *Historical Semantics — Historical Word-Formation*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs*, 29 (Berlin: Mouton), pp. 221–61
- , 1990. 'The Typological Status of Old English Word-Formation', in *Papers from the 5th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics: Cambridge, 6–9 April 1987*, ed. by Sylvia Adamson and others, *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science*, 65 (Amsterdam: Benjamins), pp. 205–23
- , 1992. 'Semantics and Vocabulary', in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, 1: *The Beginnings to 1066*, ed. by Richard M. Hogg (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 290–408

- , 2006. 'Vocabulary', in *A History of the English Language*, ed. by Richard Hogg and David Denison (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 199–270
- Kay, Christian J. 2000. 'Historical Semantics and Historical Lexicography: Will the Twain Ever Meet?', in *Lexicology, Semantics and Lexicography: Selected Papers from the Fourth G. L. Brook Symposium, Manchester, August 1998*, ed. by Julie Coleman and Christian J. Kay, *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 194 (Amsterdam: Benjamins), pp. 53–68
- , 2004. 'When Ignorance is Wisdom', in *Categorization in the History of English*, ed. by Christian J. Kay and Jeremy Smith, *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 261 (Amsterdam: Benjamins), pp. 59–70
- Kay, Christian J., and others. 2001. 'One Thesaurus Leads to Another: TOE, HTE, TME', in *Lexis and Texts in Early English: Studies Presented to Jane Roberts*, ed. by Christian Kay and Louise M. Sylvester, *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 261 (Amsterdam: Benjamins), pp. 173–86
- Kelly, S. E. (ed.). 1995. *Charters of St Augustine's Abbey, Canterbury, and Minster-in-Thanet*, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 4 (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- , (ed.). 1996. *Charters of Shaftesbury Abbey*, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 5 (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- , (ed.). 2000–01. *Charters of Abingdon Abbey*, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 7 and 8, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- , (ed.). 2009. *Charters of Peterborough Abbey*, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 14 (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Kennedy, A. G. 1983. 'Cnut's Law Code of 1018', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 11: 57–81
- , 1995. 'Law and Litigation in the Libellus Æthelwoldi episcopi', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 24: 131–83
- Ker, N. R. 1943. 'Aldred the Scribe', *Essays and Studies*, 28: 7–12
- , 1948. 'Hemming's Cartulary: A Description of the Two Worcester Cartularies in Cotton Tiberius A.xiii', in *Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke*, ed. by R. W. Hunt and others (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp. 49–75
- , 1971. 'The Handwriting of Archbishop Wulfstan', in *England before the Conquest: Studies in Primary Sources Presented to Dorothy Whitelock*, ed. by Peter Clemoes and Kathleen Hughes (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1971), pp. 315–31
- , 1990. *Catalogue of Manuscripts Containing Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957); repr. with a Supplement from *Anglo-Saxon England*, 5 (1977): 121–31 (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Kershaw, Paul. 2000. 'The Alfred-Guthrum Treaty: Scripting Accommodation and Interaction in Viking Age England', in *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, ed. by Dawn M. Hadley and Julian D. Richards, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages*, 2 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 43–64
- Keynes, Simon. 1978. 'The Declining Reputation of King Æthelred the Unready', in *Æthelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference*, ed. by David Hill, BAR, British Series, 59 (Oxford: BAR), pp. 227–53
- , 1980. *The Diplomas of King Æthelred 'the Unready' 978–1016: A Study in their Use as Historical Evidence*, Cambridge Studies in Medieval Life and Thought, 3rd ser. 13 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)



- , 1986. 'The Additions in Old English', in *The York Gospels: A Facsimile with Introductory Essays by Jonathan Alexander, Patrick McGurk, Simon Keynes and Bernard Barr* (London: [n. pub.]), pp. 81–99
- , 1988. 'Regenbald the Chancellor (*sic*)', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 10: 185–222
- , 1990. 'Royal Government and the Written Word in Late Anglo-Saxon England', in *The Uses of Literacy in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. by Rosamond McKitterick (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 226–57
- , 1991. 'The Historical Context of the Battle of Maldon', in *The Battle of Maldon AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 81–113
- , 1994. 'Cnut's Earls', in *The Reign of Cnut: King of Denmark, England and Norway*, ed. by Alexander R. Rumble, *Studies in the Early History of Britain: Makers of England* (London: Leicester University Press), pp. 43–88
- , 1997. 'The Vikings in England, c. 790–1016', in *The Oxford Illustrated History of the Vikings*, ed. by Peter Sawyer (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 48–82
- , 1999a. 'Shire', in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. by Michael Lapidge and others (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 420–22
- , 1999b. 'Thegn', in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. by Michael Lapidge and others (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 443–44
- , 2007. 'An Abbot, an Archbishop, and the Viking Raids of 1006–7 and 1009–12', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 36: 151–220
- Kibbee, Douglas A. 1991. *For to speke Frenche trewely: The French Language in England, 1000–1600: Its Status, Description and Instruction*, *Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Series 4: Studies in the History of the Language Sciences*, 60 (Amsterdam: Benjamins)
- Kimmens, Andrew C. (ed.) 1979. *The Stowe Psalter* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press)
- Kinander, Ragnar (ed.). 1935–61. *Smålands runinskrifter*, *Sveriges runinskrifter*, 4 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell)
- King, Anne. 1997. 'The Inflectional Morphology of Older Scots', in *The Edinburgh History of the Scots Language*, ed. by Charles Jones (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press), pp. 156–81
- King, Robert D. 1972. 'Intermediate Stages in Nordic *u*-Umlaut', in *Saga og språk: Studies in Language and Literature*, ed. by John M. Weinstock (Austin: Pemberton), pp. 187–99
- Kisbye, Torben. 1982a. 'Danelagen – Sprogstruktur, Befolkningsstruktur', in *Nordboer i Danelagen: den skandinaviske bosættelsestæthed i Danelagen med udgangspunkt i de sproglige vidnesbyrd*, ed. by Hans Bekker-Nielsen and Hans Frede Nielsen (Odense: Engelsk Institut, Odense University), pp. 43–66
- , 1982b. *Vikingerne i England: Sproglige spor* (København: Jensen)
- Kitson, Peter. 1990 [1992]. 'Old English Dialects and the Stages of the Transition to Middle English', *Folia Linguistica Historica*, 11: 27–87
- , 1997a. 'Old English Bird-Names (I)', *English Studies*, 78: 481–505
- , 1997b. 'When did Middle English Begin? Later than You Think', in *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs*, 103 (Berlin: Gruyter), pp. 221–69

- , 1998. 'Old English Bird-Names (II)', *English Studies*, 79: 1–22
- , 2004. 'On Margins of Error in Placing Old English Literary Dialects', in *Methods and Data in English Historical Dialectology*, ed. by Marina Dossena and Roger Lass, Linguistic Insights: Studies in Language and Communication, 16 (Bern: Lang), pp. 219–39
- Kittlick, Wolfgang. 1998. *Die Glossen der Hs. British Library, Cotton Cleopatra A.III: Phonologie, Morphologie, Wortgeographie*, Europäische Hochschulschriften, 4th ser.: Angelsächsische Sprache und Literatur, 347 (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang)
- Klaeber, F. 1902. 'Zur altenglischen Bedäübersetzung', *Anglia*, 25: 257–315
- , 1941. 'Zu dem altenglischen Gedicht auf die Schlacht bei Maldon', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 179: 32–33
- Klinck, Anne L. 2007. "'To Have and to Hold": The Bridewealth of Wives and the Mund of Widows in Anglo-Saxon England', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 51, 231–45
- Klingenberg, Heinz. 1991. 'Altnordisch *húskarl*, *Bjarkamál* = *Húskarlavǫt* und *Stiklastað*', in *Festschrift til Otta Grønvik på 75-årsdagen den 21. oktober 1991*, ed. by John Ole Askedal and others (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget), pp. 183–211
- Kłos, Malgorzata. 2010. "'To Die" in Early Middle English: *deien*, *swelten* or *sterven*?', in *Studies in Old and Middle English*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak (Warszawa: SWSPiZ), pp. 155–64
- Kluge, Friedrich. 1884–85. 'Zu altenglischen Dichtungen', *Englische Studien*, 8: 472–79
- , 1891. 'Geschichte der englischen Sprache', in *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, 1, ed. by Hermann Paul (Strassburg: Trübner), pp. 780–930
- , 1901. 'Geschichte der englischen Sprache', in *Grundriss der germanischen Philologie*, 1, ed. by Hermann Paul, 2nd edn (Strassburg: Trübner), pp. 926–1151
- , (ed.). 1995. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*, 23rd edn rev. by Elmar Seebold (Berlin: de Gruyter)
- Knieszsa, Veronika. 1994. 'The Scandinavian Elements in the Vocabulary of the Peterborough Chronicle', in *English Historical Linguistics 1992: Papers from the 7th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics: Valencia, 22–26 September 1992*, ed. by Francisco Fernández and others, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Linguistic Science, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 113 (Amsterdam: Benjamins), pp. 235–45
- Knirk, James E. 2002. 'Runes: Origin, Development of the Futhark, Functions, Applications and Methodological Considerations', in *The Nordic Languages: An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages*, ed. by Oskar Bandle and others, Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft, 22, 2 vols (Berlin: Gruyter, 2002–05), 1, 634–48
- Knowles, Dom David, and others (eds). 1972. *The Heads of Religious Houses: England and Wales 940–1216* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Kolb, E. 1962. 'English Light in the Scand. Assimilation of *ht* > *tt*', *English Studies*, 43: 307–10
- , 1989. 'Old Norse *ou/au* in English', in *In Other Words: Transcultural Studies in Philology, Translation, and Lexicology Presented to Hans Heinrich Meier on the*

- Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. by J. Lachlan Mackenzie and Richard Todd (Dordrecht: Foris), pp. 285–99
- Kopár, Lilla. 2013. *Gods and Settlers: The Iconography of Norse Mythology in Anglo-Scandinavian Sculpture*, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 25 (Turnhout: Brepols)
- Kornexl, Lucia (ed.). 1993. *Die 'Regularis Concordia' und ihre altenglische Interlinearversion*, Münchener Universitäts-Schriften, 17 (München: Fink)
- , 2006. 'Female Husbands in Old English Lexicography', in *Language and Text: Current Perspectives on English and Germanic Historical Linguistics and Philology*, ed. by Andrew James Johnston and others, Anglistische Forschungen, 359 (Heidelberg: Winter), pp. 169–78
- Kortlandt, Frederik. 2000. 'Old Norse *taka*, Gothic *tekan*, Greek *τεταγών*', *North-Western European Language Evolution*, 36: 59–65
- Kotake, Tadashi. 2008a. 'Differences in Element Order between Lindisfarne and Rushworth Two', in *Historical Englishes in Varieties of Texts and Contexts: The Global COE Programme, International Conference 2007*, ed. by Masachiyo Amano and others, Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature, 22 (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang), pp. 63–77
- , 2008b. 'Notes on the Relationship between Lindisfarne and Rushworth Two: A Lexical Analysis of *andswarian* and *andwyrðan*', *The Round Table* (Tokyo: Keio University), 22: 31–44
- , 2012. 'Lindisfarne and Rushworth One Reconsidered', *Notes and Queries*, 59: 14–19
- Kotzor, Günter. 1985. 'Wind and Weather: Semantic Analysis and the Classification of Old English Lexemes', in *Problems of Old English Lexicography: Studies in Memory of Angus Cameron*, ed. by Alfred Bammesberger, Eichstätter Beiträge, 15 (Regensburg: Pustet), pp. 175–95
- Kozuka, Yoshitaka. 2006. *A Linguistic Study of the Authorship of the West Saxon Gospels* (Osaka: Osaka University Press)
- Krapp, George Philip (ed.). 1932. *The Vercelli Book*, Anglo-Saxon Poetic Records, 2 (New York: Columbia University Press)
- Kries, Susanne. 2003. *Skandinavisch-schottische Sprachbeziehungen im Mittelalter: der alt-nordische Lehneinfluss*, North-Western European Language Evolution Supplement, 20 (Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark)
- Kroch, Anthony, and Ann Taylor. 1997. 'Verb Movement in Old and Middle English: Dialect Variation and Language Contact', in *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, ed. by Ans van Kemenade and Nigel Vincent (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 297–325
- Krogmann, Willy. 1936. 'Ae. Wortdeutungen', *Anglia*, 60: 369–73
- Kross, Theodor. 1911. *Die Namen der Gefäße bei den Angel-Sachsen* (Erlangen: Junge & Son)
- Krygier, Marcin. 2009. 'Scandinavian Influence on the Middle English Prepositional System', Paper Delivered at Foreign Influences on Medieval English, Warsaw, 12–13 December 2009
- , 2011. 'On the Scandinavian Origin of the Old English preposition *til* "till"', in *Foreign Influences on Medieval English*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak and Magdalena Bator,

- Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature, 28 (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang), pp. 129–38
- Kuhn, Hans. 1956. 'Die Grenzen der germanischen Gefolgschaft', *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung für Rechtsgeschichte: Germanistische Abteilung*, 73: 1–83
- , 1991. *Das altnordische Seekriegswesen*, ed. by Sigrid Engeler and Dietrich Hofmann (Heidelberg: Winter)
- Kullnick, Max. 1902. *Studien über den Wortschatz in 'Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knyzt'* (Berlin: Mayer und Müller)
- Laborde, E. D. 1936. *Byrhtnoth and Maldon* (London: Heinemann)
- Laing, Margaret. 1993. *Catalogue of Sources for a Linguistic Atlas of Early Medieval English* (Cambridge: Brewer)
- Laing, Margaret, and Roger Lass. 2006. 'Early Middle English Dialectology: Problems and Prospects', in *The Handbook of the History of English*, ed. by Ans van Kemenade and Bettelou Los (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 417–51
- Lange, J. de. 1935. *The Relation and Development of English and Icelandic Outlaw-Traditions*, Nederlandse bijdragen op het gebied van germaanse philologie en linguïstiek, 6 (Harlem: Willink)
- Langefeld, Brigitte (ed.). 2003. *The Old English Version of the Enlarged Rule of Chrodegang*, Münchener Universitäts-Schriften, 26 (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang)
- Lapidge, Michael. 1984. 'Vita Prima Sancti Neoti et Translatio', in *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, xvii: *The Annals of St Neot with Vita Prima Sancti Neoti*, ed. by David Dumville and Michael Lapidge (Cambridge: Brewer), pp. lxii–cxxiv
- , 1999a. 'Ælfric Bata', in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. by Michael Lapidge and others (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 7–8
- , 1999b. 'Byrhtferth', in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. by Michael Lapidge and others (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 78–79
- Lapsley, Gaillard Thomas. 1904. 'Cornage and Drengage', *American Historical Review*, 9: 670–95
- Larson, Laurence Marcellus (trans.). 1935. *The Earliest Norwegian Laws Being the Gulathing Law and the Frostathing Law*, Records of Civilization: Sources and Studies, 20 (New York: Columbia University Press)
- Lass, Roger. 1992a. 'Front Rounded Vowels in Old English', in *Evidence for Old English: Material and Theoretical Bases for Reconstruction*, ed. by Fran Colman, Edinburgh Studies in English Language, 2 (Edinburgh: Donald), pp. 88–116
- , 1992b. 'Phonology and Morphology', in *The Cambridge History of the English Language*, ii: 1066–1476, ed. by Norman Blake (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 23–155
- , 1994. *Old English: A Historical Linguistic Companion* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- , 1997. *Historical Linguistics and Language Change*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 81 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- , 2006. 'Phonology and Morphology', in *A History of the English Language*, ed. by Richard Hogg and David Denison (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 43–108

- Lawson, M. K. 1993. *Cnut: The Danes in England in the Early Eleventh Century* (London: Longman)
- Lazzari, Loredana. 2003. 'Il Glossario latino-inglese antico nel manoscritto di Anversa e Londra ed il Glossario di Ælfrici: dipendenza diretta o derivazione comune?', *Linguistica e filologia*, 16: 159–90
- Lea, Elisabeth Mary. 1894. 'The Language of the Northumbrian Gloss to the Gospel of St Mark', *Anglia*, 16: 63–206
- Lee, Christina. 2007. *Feasting the Dead: Food and Drink in the Burial Rituals of the Anglo-Saxons* (Woodbridge: Boydell and Brewer)
- Lefebvre, Claire. 1984. 'Grammaires en contact: Définition et perspectives de recherche', *Revue québécoise de linguistique*, 14.1: 11–47
- Lehiste, Ilse. 1958. 'Names of the Scandinavians in the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 73: 6–22
- Lehrer, A. 1974. *Semantic Fields and Lexical Structure*, North-Holland Linguistic Series, 11 (Amsterdam: North-Holland)
- Lehmann, Winfred P. (ed.). 1986. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary* (Leiden: Brill)
- , 1994. 'Gothic and the Reconstruction of Proto-Germanic', in *The Germanic Languages*, ed. by Ekkehard König and Johan van der Auwera, Routledge Language Family Descriptions (London: Routledge), pp. 19–37
- Lendinara, Patrizia. 1981. 'Tecnicismi nel *Salomone e Saturno* in prosa (ms. CCCC 422)', Appendix in *Il Salomone e Saturno in prosa del ms. CCCC 422*, ed. by Gilda Cilluffo, Quaderni di filologia germanica, 2 (Palermo: University of Palermo), pp. 97–124
- , 1983. 'Il Colloquio di Ælfric e Il Colloquio di Ælfric Bata', in *Feor ond neah: Scritti di filologia germanica in memoria di Augusto Scaffidi Abbate*, Annali de la Facoltà di lettere e filosofia dell'Università di Palermo, Studi e ricerche, 3 (Palermo: University of Palermo), pp. 173–249
- Lenker, Ursula. 1997. *Die westsächsische Evangelienversion und die Perikopenordnungen im angelsächsischen England*, Münchener Universitäts-Schriften, 20 (München: Fink)
- Lennard, Reginald. 1944. 'The Origin of the Fiscal Carucate', *Economic History Review*, 14: 51–63
- Lerer, Seth. 1997. 'The Genre of *The Grave* and the Origins of the Early Middle English Lyric', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 58: 127–61
- Leslie, R. F. (ed.). 1966. *The Wanderer*, Old and Middle English Texts (Manchester: Manchester University Press)
- Leumann, Manu. 1977. *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*, in Manu Leumann, J. B. Hofmann, and Anton Szantyr, *Lateinische Grammatik*, 3 vols (München: Beck, 1977–79), I
- Lewis, C. P. 1991. 'The Early Earls of Norman England', *Anglo-Norman Studies*, 13: 207–23
- Lewis, Charlton T., and Charles Short (eds). 1879. *A Latin Dictionary Founded on Andrew's Edition of Freund's Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Liberman, Anatoly. 2005. *Word Origins – And How We Know Them: Etymology for Everyone* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Liebermann, F. 1903. 'Drei nordhumbrische Urkunden um 1100', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 111: 275–84



- , (ed.). 1903–16. *Die Gesetze der Angelsachsen*, 3 vols (Halle: Niemeyer)
- , 1910. 'Die Friedlosigkeit bei den Angelsachsen', in *Festschrift Heinrich Brunner zum siebzigsten Geburtstag dargebracht von Schülern und Verehrern* (Weimar: Böhlau), pp. 17–37
- Lidén, Evald. 1892. 'Smärre språkhistoriska bidrag', in *Uppsalastudier tillegnade Sophus Bugge på hans 60-åra födelsedag* (Uppsala: Almqvist), pp. 79–96
- , 1886. 'Etymologiska bidrag', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 3: 235–43
- Liestøl, Aslak. 1979. 'Ringeringen i Forsa. Kva er han, og når vart han smidd?', *Saga och sed: Kungliga Gustav Adolfs Akademiens årsbok*: 12–27
- Liggins, Elizabeth M. 1970. 'The Authorship of the Old English *Orosius*', *Anglia*, 88: 289–322
- Lindelöf, Uno. 1901. *Die südnorthumbrische Mundart des 10. Jahrhunderts: die Sprache der sog. Glosse Rushworth<sup>2</sup>*, Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik, 10 (Bonn: Hanstein)
- , (ed.). 1909–14. *Der Lambeth-Psalter: eine altenglische Interlinearversion des Psalters in der Hs. 427 der Erzbischöflichen Lambeth Palace Library*, Acta Societatis Scientiarum Fennicae, 35.1 and 43.3, 2 vols (Helsingfors: Druckerei der finnischen Literaturgesellschaft)
- , (ed.). 1927. *Rituale Ecclesiae Dunelmensis: The Durham Collectar*, new edn, Publications of the Surtees Society, 140 (Durham: Surtees Society)
- Lindkvist, Thomas. 2003. 'Kings and Provinces in Sweden', in *The Cambridge History of Scandinavia*, 1: *Prehistory to 1520*, ed. by Knut Helle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 221–34
- Lindow, John. 1976. *Comitatus, Individual and Honor: Studies in North Germanic Institutional Vocabulary*, University of California Publications in Linguistics, 83 (Berkeley: University of California Press)
- Lindsay, W. M. (ed.). 1911. *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarum sive Originum*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Lindström, Bengt. 2004. Review of *The Old English Life of St Nicholas with the Old English Life of St Giles*, ed. by Elaine Treharne, Leeds Texts and Monographs, n.s., 15 (Leeds: School of English), *Studia Neophilologia*, 76: 66–85
- A Linguistic Atlas of Early Middle English 1150–1325*. 2007–. Compiled by Margaret Laing and Roger Lass (Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh) <<http://www.lel.ed.ac.uk/ihd/laeme1/laeme1.html>>
- Liuzza, Roy Michael (ed.). 1994–2000. *The Old English Version of the Gospels*, Early English Text Society, o.s., 304 and 314, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- , 2001. 'Anglo-Saxon Prognostics in Context: A Survey and Handlist of Manuscripts', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 30: 181–230
- Lloyd, Albert L., and others (eds). 1988–. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Althochdeutschen* (Göttingen and Zurich: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht)
- Löfving, Carl. 1991. 'Who Ruled the Region East of the Skagerrak in the Eleventh Century?', in *Social Approaches to Viking Studies*, ed. by Ross Samson (Glasgow: Cruithne), pp. 147–56

- Logeman, H. (ed.). 1888. *The Rule of S. Benet: Latin and Anglo-Saxon Interlinear Version*, Early English Text Society, o.s., 90 (London: Trübner)
- , 1906. 'On Some Cases of Scandinavian Influence in English', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen*, 117: 29–46 and 268–86
- Loman, Bengt. 1961. *Fornsvenska verbalasubstantiv på -an, -ning och -else*, Stockholm Studies in Scandinavian Philology, n.s., 4 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell)
- Los, Bettelou. 2000. 'Onginnan/beginnan with bare and *to*-infinitive in Ælfric', in *Pathways of Change: Grammaticalization in English*, ed. by Olga Fischer and others, Studies in Language Companion Series, 53 (Amsterdam: Benjamins), pp. 251–74
- Lowe, Kathryn Alexandra. 1990. 'The Anglo-Saxon Vernacular Will: Studies in Texts and their Transmission' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge)
- , 1993. "As fre as thowt"? Some Medieval Copies and Translations of Old English Wills', in *English Manuscript Studies 1100–1700*, iv, ed. by Peter Beal and Jeremy Griffiths (London: British Library and University of Toronto Press), pp. 1–23
- , 2004. 'The Anglo-Saxon Contents of a Lost Register from Bury St Edmunds', *Anglia*, 121: 515–34
- , 2008. 'Post-Conquest Bilingual Composition in Memoranda from Bury St Edmunds', *Review of English Studies*, n.s., 59: 52–66
- Loyd, Lewis C., and Doris Mary Stenton (eds). 1950. *Sir Christopher Hatton's Book of Seals to which is Appended a Select List of the Works of Frank Merry Stenton* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Loyn, H. R. 1955. 'Gesiths and Thegns in Anglo-Saxon England from the Seventh to the Tenth Century', *English Historical Review*, 70: 529–49
- , 1984. *The Governance of Anglo-Saxon England, 500–1087* (London: Arnold)
- Luard, Henry Richards (ed.). 1864–69. *Annales monastici*, *Rerum britannicarum medii ævi scriptores*, 36, 5 vols (London: Longman)
- Lucas, Peter J. 1970. 'The Cloud in the Interpretation of the Old English Exodus', *English Studies*, 51: 297–311
- , (ed.). 1994. *Exodus*, Exeter Medieval English Texts and Studies, rev. edn (Exeter: University of Exeter Press)
- Luick, Karl. 1901. Review of Erik Björkman, *Scandinavian Loanwords in Middle English*, 1 (Halle: Niemeyer, 1900), *Archiv für das stadium der neueren Sprachen*, 107: 412–19
- , 1964. *Historische Grammatik der englischen Sprache (mit dem nach den hinterlassenen Aufzeichnungen ausgearbeiteten zweiten Kapitel herausgegeben von Friedrich Wild und Herbert Koziol)*, 1 (Stuttgart: Tauchnitz; orig. publ. Leipzig: Tauchnitz, 1914)
- Lund, Niels. 1986. 'The Armies of Swein Forkbeard and Cnut: *leding* or *lið*', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 15: 105–18
- , 1993. 'Danish Military Organisation', in *The Battle of Maldon: Fiction and Fact*, ed. by Janet Cooper (London: Hambledon), pp. 109–26
- Lundgren, Timothy J. 1996. 'Hereward and Outlawry in Fenland Culture: A Study of Local Narrative and Tradition in Medieval England' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University)
- Lutz, Angelika. 1984. 'Spellings of the *waldend* Group—Again', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 13: 51–64



- , 2012a. 'Language Contact in the Scandinavian Period', in *Handbook of the History of English: Rethinking and Extending Approaches and Methods*, ed. by Terttu Nevalainen and Elizabeth Closs Traugott (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 508–17
- , 2012b. 'Norse Influence on English in the Light of General Contact Linguistics', in *English Historical Linguistics 2010: Selected Papers from the Sixteenth International Conference on English Historical Linguistics (ICEHL 16), Pécs, 23–27 August 2010*, ed. by Irén Hegedüs and Alexandra Fodor, *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory*, 325 (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2012), pp. 15–41
- Madan, Falconer, and H. H. E. Craster. 1924. *A Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts in the Bodleian Library at Oxford*, ed. by Falconer Madan and others, 7 vols in 8 (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1895–1953), vi
- Magennis, Hugh (ed.). 1994. *The Anonymous Old English Legend of the Seven Sleepers*, *Durham Medieval Texts*, 7 (Durham: University of Durham, Department of English Studies)
- Magnússon, Ásgeir Blöndal. 1989. *Íslensk orðsifjabók*, 2nd edn ([n.p.]: Orðabók Háskólans)
- Maitland, F. W. 1890. 'Northumbrian Tenures', *English Historical Review*, 20: 625–32
- Maley, Y. 1944. 'The Language of the Law', in *Language in Social Life*, ed. by J. Gibbons (London: Longman), pp. 11–50
- Malmer, Brita. 1974. *King Canute's Coinage in the Northern Countries*, The Dorothea Coke Memorial Lecture in Northern Studies Delivered 30 May 1972 at University College London (London: Viking Society for Northern Research)
- Mancho-Barés, Guzmán. 1997. 'Norse Vocabulary in the *Peterborough Chronicle*: A Case-Study of Historical Sociolinguistics', in *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference of the Spanish Society for Medieval Language and Literature*, ed. by Margarita Giménez Bon and Vickie Olsen (Zaragoza: Pórtico), pp. 174–87
- Mann, Stuart E. 1984–87. *An Indo-European Comparative Dictionary* (Hamburg: Buske)
- Marburg, Dietrich. 1856. 'Das Hundert Silbers', *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, 10: 223–40
- Marchand, Hans. 1969. *The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation: A Synchronic-Diachronic Approach*, 2nd edn (München: Beck)
- Marsden, Richard. 2000. 'Translation by Committee? The "Anonymous" Text of the Old English Hexateuch', in *The Old English Hexateuch: Aspects and Approaches*, ed. by Rebecca Barnhouse and Benjamin C. Withers (Kalamazoo: Institute of Medieval Studies, Western Michigan University), pp. 41–85
- , (ed.). 2008. *The Old English Heptateuch and Ælfric's 'Libellus de veteri testamento et novo'*, 1, *Early English Text Society*, o.s., 330 (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Marstrander, Carl J. S. 1915. *Bidrag til det norske sprogs historie i Irland*, *Videnskapsselskaps Skrifter*, 2, Hist-Filos. Klasse, 5 (Oslo: [n. pub.])
- Martens, Irmelin. 2004. 'Indigenous and Imported Viking Age Weapons in Norway — A Problem with European Implications', *Journal of Nordic Archaeological Science*, 14: 125–37
- Matzerath, Joseph. 1912. *Die altenglischen Namen der Geldwerte* (Heidelberg: Winter)

- Maund, K. L. 1991. *Ireland, Wales and England in the Eleventh Century*, Studies in Celtic Ireland, 12 (Woodbridge: Boydell)
- McDougall, Ian. 1993. 'Serious Entertainment: An Examination of a Peculiar Type of Viking Atrocity', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 22: 201–25
- McIntosh, Angus. 1976. 'The Language of the Extant Versions of *Havelok the Dane*', *Medium Ævum*, 45: 36–49
- McKinnell, John. 1975. 'On the Date of *The Battle of Maldon*', *Medium Ævum*, 43: 121–36
- McKinney, Phillip Randall. 1994. 'To munde us sylfum: A Semantic Study of the Old English Legal Terms for Protection' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University)
- McMahon, April M. S. 1994. *Understanding Language Change* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- McWhorter, John H. 2002. 'What Happened to English?', *Diachronica*, 19: 217–72
- Meaney, Audrey L. 1985. 'Ælfric's Use of his Sources in his Homily on Auguries', *English Studies*, 66: 477–95
- [MED =] *Middle English Dictionary*, ed. by Hans Kurath and others (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1952–2001)
- Meiser, Gerhard. 1998. *Historische Laut- und Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft)
- Melberg, Håkon. 1949–51. *Origin of the Scandinavian Nations and Languages: An Introduction*, 2 vols (Oslo: Aschehoug & København: Munksgaard)
- Mellinkoff, David. 1963. *The Language of the Law* (Boston: Little, Brown)
- Menner, Robert J. 1934. 'Farman Vindicatus: The Linguistic Value of *Rushworth T*, Anglia, 58: 1–27
- , (ed.). 1941. *The Poetical Dialogues of Solomon and Saturn* (New York: Modern Language Association of America; London: Oxford University Press)
- , 1944. 'Two Old English Words', *Modern Language Notes*, 59: 106–12
- Meritt, Herbert. 1933. 'Old English Scratched Glosses in Cotton MS Tiberius C.ii', *American Journal of Philology*, 54: 305–22
- , 1941. 'Some Minor Ways of Word-Formation in Old English', in *Stanford Studies in Language and Literature*, ed. by Hardin Craig (Stanford: Stanford University Press), pp. 74–80
- , (ed.). 1945. *Old English Glosses (A Collection)*, The Modern Language Association of America, General Series, 16 (New York: Modern Language Association of America & London: Oxford University Press)
- , 1947. 'Studies in Old English Vocabulary', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 46: 413–27
- , 1954. *Fact and Lore about Old English Words* (Stanford: Stanford University Press & London: Oxford University Press)
- , 1959. *The Old English Prudentius Glosses at Boulogne-sur-Mer*, Stanford Studies in Language and Literature, 16 (Stanford: Stanford University Press)
- , 1968. *Some of the Hardest Glosses in Old English* (Stanford: Stanford University Press)

- Merwe Scholtz, Hendrik van der. 1927. *The Kenning in Anglo-Saxon and Old Norse Poetry* (Utrecht: Dekker)
- Meyer, Marc A. 1980. 'Land Charters and the Legal Position of Anglo-Saxon Women', in *The Women of England: From Anglo-Saxon Times to the Present*, ed. by Barbara Kanner (London: Mansell), pp. 57–82
- Meys, W. J. 1975. *Compound Adjectives in English and the Ideal Speaker-Listener: A Study of Compounding in a Transformational-Generative Framework*, North-Holland Linguistic Series, 18 (Amsterdam: North Holland)
- Mezger, Fritz. 1933. 'Middle English run', *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, 48: 1036–40
- , 1952. 'Self-Judgment in Old English Documents', *Modern Language Notes*, 67: 106–09
- Miedma, H. T. J. 1972–73. 'Ist die altfriesische Präposition til "bis" ein altnordisches Lehnwort der Wikingerzeit?', *Us Wurk*, 21–22: 173–80
- , 1978. 'Van Dublin naar Dokkum: Oudnoors jarl, "dux", Oudfries jarla en de mogelijkheid van oudnoorse relicten in het Oudfries', *Naamkunde*, 10: 48–80
- Milfull, Inge B. (ed.). 1996. *The Hymns of the Anglo-Saxon Church: A Study and Edition of the 'Durham Hymnal'*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 17 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Millar, Robert McColl. 1997a. 'English a koinëoid? Some Suggestion for Reasons behind the Creoloid-Like Features of a Language Which Is Not a Creoloid', *Vienna English Working Papers*, 6.2: 19–48
- , 1997b. 'Some Patterns in the Non-Historical Demonstrative Usage of the Peterborough Chronicle Annals 1070–1121', *Notes and Queries*, 242: 161–64
- , 2000. *System Collapse, System Rebirth: The Demonstrative Pronouns of English 900–1350* (Oxford: Lang)
- Miller, D. Gary. 2004. 'The Morphosyntactic Legacy of Scand-English Contact', in *For the Loue of Inglis Lede*, ed. by Marcin Krygier and Liliana Sikorska, *Medieval English Mirror*, 1 (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang), pp. 9–39
- , 2006. *Latin Suffixal Derivatives in English and their Indo-European Ancestry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- , 2010. *Language Change and Linguistic Theory*, 2 vols (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- , 2012. *External Influences on English: From its Beginnings to the Renaissance* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Miller, Thomas (ed. and trans.). 1890–98. *The Old English Version of Bede's Ecclesiastical History of the English People*, Early English Text Society, o.s., 95, 96, 110, 111, 4 vols (London: Trübner)
- Milroy, James, and Lesley Milroy. 1985. 'Linguistic Change, Social Network and Speaker Innovation', *Journal of Linguistics*, 21: 339–84
- Minkova, Donka. 2003. *Alliteration and Sound Change in Early English*, Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, 101 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Mitchell, Bruce. 1985. *Old English Syntax*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

- Miranda-García, Antonio, and others. 2008. 'Morphological Features in the Translatorship Attribution of the West Saxon Gospels', *English Studies*, 89: 210–25
- Moffat, Dough. 1984. 'The Grave in Early Middle English Verse: Metaphor and Archaeology', *Florilegium*, 6: 96–102
- , (ed.). 1987. *The Soul's Address to the Body: The Worcester Fragments*, Medieval Texts and Studies, 1 (East Lansing: Colleagues)
- , 1992. 'Anglo-Saxon Scribes and Old English Verse', *Speculum*, 67: 805–27
- Moltke, Erik. 1985. *Runes and their Origin: Denmark and Elsewhere* (Copenhagen: National Museum of Denmark)
- Morgan, Philip, and Caroline Thorn (eds). 1986. *Domesday Book*, xxxi: *Lincolnshire* (Chichester: Phillimore)
- Morris, Richard. 1868. *Old English Homilies and Homiletic Treatises (Sawles warde, and þe wohunge of Ure Lauerd: Ureisuns of Ure Louerd and of Ure Lefdi, &c.) of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries: First series*, Early English Text Society, o.s., 29 and 34, 2 vols (London: Trübner)
- Morris, Richard K. 1998. 'Churches in York and its Hinterland: Building Patterns and Stone Sources in the 11th and 12th Centuries', in *Minsters and Parish Churches: The Local Church in Transition 950–1200*, ed. by John Blair (Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology), pp. 191–99
- Morris, William Still. 1968. 'Possible Solutions to Some Old English Words of Uncertain Etymology' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Stanford University)
- Morsbach, Lorenz. 1929. 'Umschriften ags. Urkunden in einer Pergamentrolle des späten 13. Jahrhunderts: Texte und Erläuterungen', in *Britannica: Max Förster zum sechzigsten Geburtstage 1869–1929* (Leipzig: Tauchnitz), pp. 106–38
- Morse-Gagné, Elise E. 2003. 'Viking Pronouns in England: Charting the Course of THEY, THEIR, and THEM' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania)
- Mynors, R. A. B., and others (eds and trans.). 1998–99. William of Malmesbury, *Gesta Regum Anglorum: The History of the English Kings*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Napier, A. S. (ed.). 1894. *History of the Holy Rood-Tree, A Twelfth Century Version of the Cross-Legend, with Notes on the Orthography of the 'Ormulum' (with a Facsimile) and a Middle English Compassio Mariae*, Early English Text Society, o.s., 103 (London: Paul, Trench and Trübner)
- , 1889. 'Odds and Ends', *Modern Language Notes*, 4: 274–79
- , 1897. 'Old and Middle English Notes', *Modern Language Quarterly*, 1: 51–53
- , 1900. *Old English Glosses Chiefly Unpublished*, Anecdota Oxoniensia (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- , 1905–06. 'Contributions to Old English Lexicography', *Transactions of the Philological Society*: 265–357
- Napier, A. S., and W. H. Stevenson (eds). 1895. *The Crawford Collection of Early Charters and Documents Now in the Bodleian Library* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Nation, I. S. P. 1990. *Teaching and Learning Vocabulary* (Boston: Heinle & Heinle)
- Nees, Lawrence. 2003. 'Reading Aldred's Colophon for the Lindisfarne Gospels', *Speculum*, 78: 333–77

- Neff, Charlotte. 1989. 'Scandinavian Elements in the Wantage Code of Æthelred II', *Journal of Legal History*, 10: 285–313
- Neumann, Elsbeth. 1953. 'Lateinisch 'annus' – gotisch 'apna-' und lateinisch 'sānctus' – altisländisch 'sáttir': zwei Untersuchungen zu italisch-germanischen Isoglossen' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Universität zu Tübingen)
- [NGL =] *Norges gamle love indtil 1387*, ed. by R. Keyser and others, 5 vols (Oslo: Grøndahl, 1846–95)
- Nielsen, Hans Frede. 1985. *Old English and the Continental Germanic Languages: A Survey of Morphological and Phonological Interrelations*, Innsbrucker Beiträge zur Sprachwissenschaft, 33, 2nd edn (Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck)
- , 1998a. *The Continental Backgrounds of English and its Insular Development until 1154*, A Journey through the History of the English Language in England and America, 1 (Odense: Odense University Press)
- , 1998b. 'The Linguistic Status of the Early Runic Inscriptions of Scandinavia', in *Runeninschriften als Quellen interdisziplinärer Forschung: Abhandlungen des Vierten internationalen Symposiums über Runen und Runeninschriften in Göttingen vom 4.–9. August 1995*, ed. by Klaus Düwel, *Ergänzungsbande zum Reallexikon der germanischen Altertumskunde*, 15 (Berlin: Gruyter), pp. 539–55
- , 2000. *The Early Runic Language of Scandinavia: Studies in Germanic Dialect Geography*, Indogermanische Bibliothek, 1 (Heidelberg: Winter)
- Niermeyer, J. F., and others (eds). 2002. *Mediae latinitatis lexicon minus: Lexique latin médiéval – Medieval Latin Dictionary – Mittellateinisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols (Leiden: Brill)
- Niles, John D. 1987. 'Skaldic Technique in *Brunanburh*', *Scandinavian Studies*, 59: 356–66
- Nightingale, Pamela. 1983. 'The Ora, the Mark and the Mancus: Weight Standards and the Coinage in Eleventh-Century England. Part I', *Numismatic Chronicle*, 143: 248–57
- , 1984. 'The Ora, the Mark and the Mancus: Weight Standards and the Coinage in Eleventh-Century England. Part II', *Numismatic Chronicle*, 144: 234–48
- , 1985. 'The Evolution of Weight-Standards and the Creation of New Monetary and Commercial Links in Northern Europe from the Tenth Century to the Twelfth Century', *Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., 38: 192–209
- , 1987. 'The Origin of the Court of Husting and the Danish Influence on London's Development into a Capital City', *English Historical Review*, 102: 559–78
- Nils-Lennart, Johannesson. 2000. 'On the Time-Depth of Variability: Orm and Farmon as h-droppers', in *Language Structure and Variation*, ed. by Magnus Ljung, *Stockholm Studies in English*, 92 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell), pp. 107–18
- Noreen, Adolf Gotthard. 1894. *Abriss der Urgermanischen Lautlehre* (Strassburg: Trübner)
- , 1904. *Altnordische Grammatik*, II: *Altschwedische Grammatik mit Einschluss des Altguthnischen*, Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte, 8 (Halle: Niemeyer)
- , 1913. *Geschichte der nordischen Sprachen: besonders in altnordischer Zeit*, Grundriss der Germanischen Philologie, 4, 3rd edn (Strassburg: Trübner)

- , 1923. *Altnordische Grammatik*, 1: *Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik (Laut- und Flexionslehre)*, Sammlung kurzer Grammatiken germanischer Dialekte, 4, 4th edn (Halle: Niemeyer)
- O'Brien, Bruce R. 1999. *God's Peace and King's Peace: The Laws of Edward the Confessor*, The Middle Ages Series (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press)
- O'Brien O'Keeffe, Katherine. 1985. 'The Text of Aldhelm's Enigma no. C in Oxford, Bodleian Library, Rawlinson C. 697 and Exeter Riddle 40', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 14: 61–73
- , (ed.). 2001. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Collaborative Edition*, v: *MS C* (Cambridge: Brewer)
- Ó Corráin, Donnchadh. 1987. 'The Semantic Development of Old Norse *jarl* in Old and Middle Irish', in *Proceedings of the Tenth Viking Congress: Larkollen, Norway, 1985*, ed. by James E. Knirk, Universitetets Oldsaksamlings Skrifter, n.s., 9 (Oslo: Universitetets Oldsaksamling), pp. 287–93
- O'Donovan, M. A. (ed.). 1988. *Charters of Sherborne*, Anglo-Saxon Charters, 3 (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- [OEC =] *The Complete Corpus of Old English in Machine Readable Form* (TEI Compatible Version), ed. by Antoinette di Paolo Healey <<http://ets.umd.umich.edu/o/oec/>> [accessed from 10 October 2004 to 20 August 2011]
- [OED 1989 =] *Oxford English Dictionary*, ed. by John A. Simpson and Edmund Weiner, 2nd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989)
- [OED 2000– =] *Oxford English Dictionary*, ed. by John A. Simpson, 3rd edn (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000–) <[www.oed.com](http://www.oed.com)> [accessed from 10 October 2004 to 20 August 2011]
- Oess, Guido (ed.). 1910. *Der altenglische Arundel-Psalter: eine Interlinearversion in der Handschrift Arundel 60 des Britischen Museums*, Anglistische Forschungen, 30 (Heidelberg: Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung)
- Öhman, Suzanne. 1953. 'Theories of the "Linguistic Field"', *Word*, 9: 123–34
- Okasha, Elisabeth. 1971. *Hand-List of Anglo-Saxon Non-Runic Inscriptions* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Olsen, Karin Edith Edeltrau. 1995. 'Metaphorical Language in the Early Poetry of Northwest Europe' (unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto)
- Olszewska, E. S. 1933. 'Illustrations of Norse Formulas in English', *Leeds Studies in English*, 2: 76–84
- , 1928–36 [1936]. 'Legal Borrowings from Norse in Old and Middle English', *Saga-Book of the Viking Society for Northern Research*, 11: 233–38
- O'Neill, Patrick P. 1992. 'The English Version', in *The Eadwine Psalter: Text, Image, and Monastic Culture in Twelfth-Century Canterbury*, ed. by Margaret Gibson and others, Publications of the Modern Humanities Research Association, 14 (London: Modern Humanities Research Association), pp. 123–38
- , 1997. 'On the Date, Provenance and Relationship of the "Solomon and Saturn" Dialogues', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 26: 139–68
- Onions, C. Talbot. 1908–09. 'Some Early Middle English Spellings', *Modern Language Review*, 4: 505–07



- , 1931. 'God and Good Men', *Times Literary Supplement*, 13 August, p. 621
- [ONP = ] *Ordbog over det norrøne prosasprog: A Dictionary of Old Norse Prose*. 1989–. Ed. by Helle Degenbol and others (København: Arnemagnæanske Kommission)
- Orchard, Andy. 1999. 'Wulfstan the Homilist', in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. by Michael Lapidge and others (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 494–95
- Orel, Vladimir. 2003. *A Handbook of Germanic Etymology* (Leiden: Brill)
- Orton, Peter. 1994. 'On the Transmission and Phonology of The Battle of Brunanburh', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s., 25: 1–27
- Ottosson, Kjartan. 2002. 'Old Nordic: A Definition and Delimitation of the Period', in *The Nordic Languages: An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages*, ed. by Oskar Bandle and others, *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 22, 2 vols (Berlin: Gruyter, 2002–05), I, 787–93
- Owen-Crocker, Gale R. 1998. 'The Search for Anglo-Saxon Skin Garments and the Documentary Evidence', in *Leather and Fur: Aspects of Early Medieval Trade and Technology*, ed. by Esther Cameron (London: Archetype), pp. 27–43
- , 2004. *Dress in Anglo-Saxon England*, rev. edn (Woodbridge: Boydell)
- Padelford, Frederick Morgan. 1899. *Old English Musical Terms*, *Bönnner Beiträge zur Anglistik*, 4 (Bonn: Hanstein)
- Page, R. I. 2001. 'Recent Work on Old English Glosses: The Case of Boethius', in *Mittelalterliche Volkssprachige Glossen: International Fachkonferenz des Zentrums für Mittelalterstudien der Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg 2. bis 4. August 1999*, ed. by Rolf Bergmann and others, *Germanische Bibliothek*, 13 (Heidelberg: Winter), pp. 189–215
- Pantos, Alik. 2004. "In medðle oððe an þinge": The Old English Vocabulary of Assembly', in *Assembly Places and Practices in Medieval Europe*, ed. by Alik Pantos and Sarah Sample (Dublin: Four Courts), pp. 181–201
- Parsons, David. 2001. 'How Long Did the Scandinavian Language Survive in England? Again', in *Vikings and the Danelaw: Select Papers from the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Viking Congress, Nottingham and York, 21–30 August 1997*, ed. by James Graham-Campbell and others (Oxford: Oxbow), pp. 299–312
- Pedersen, Anne. 2008. 'Viking Weaponry', in *The Viking World*, ed. by Stefan Brink in collaboration with Neil Price (London: Routledge), pp. 204–11
- Pelteret, David A. E. 1990. *Catalogue of English Post-Conquest Vernacular Documents* (Woodbridge: Boydell)
- , 1991. 'Slavery in the Danelaw', in *Social Approaches to Viking Studies*, ed. by Ross Samson (Glasgow: Cruithne), pp. 179–88
- , 1995. *Slavery in Early Medieval England: From the Reign of Alfred until the Twelfth Century*, *Studies in Anglo-Saxon History*, 7 (Woodbridge: Boydell)
- Peters, Hans. 1981. 'Zum skandinavischen Lehnwort im Altenglischen', *Sprachwissenschaft*, 6: 85–124
- Pheifer, J. D. (ed.). 1974. *Old English Glosses in the Épinal-Erfurt Glossary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)



- Phillips, Betty S. 1997. 'The *Peterborough Chronicle* Diphthongs', in *Studies in Middle English Linguistics*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, Trends in Linguistics, 103 (Berlin: Gruyter), pp. 429–38
- Phillipotts, B. S. 1929. "'The Battle of Maldon': Some Danish Affinities', *Modern Language Review*, 24: 172–90
- Picard, Barbara (ed.). 1980. *Das altenglische Aegildusleben in MS CCCC 303*, Hochschul-sammlung Philosophie Literaturwissenschaft, 7 (Freiburg: Hochschulverlag)
- Plummer, Charles (ed.). 1892–99. *Two of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicles Parallel: With Supplementary Extracts from Others; A Revised Text with Introduction, Notes, Appendices and Glossary on the Basis of an Edition by John Earle*, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Pokorny, Julius (ed.). 1959–69. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols (Bern: Francke)
- Pollock, Frederick. 1893. 'Anglo-Saxon Law', *English Historical Review*, 8: 239–71
- Pons-Sanz, Sara María. 2000. *Analysis of the Scandinavian Loanwords in the Aldredian Glosses to the Lindisfarne Gospels*, Studies in English Language and Linguistics: Monographs, 9 (València: Department of English and German Philology, Universitat de València)
- , 2004. 'A Sociolinguistic Approach to the Norse-Derived Words in the Glosses to the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels', in *New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics: Selected Papers from 12 ICEHL, Glasgow, 21–26 August 2002*, ed. by Christian Kay and others, Amsterdam Studies in the History and Theory of Linguistic Science, Series 4: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 252, 2 vols (Amsterdam: Benjamins), II: *Lexis and Transmission*, pp. 177–92
- , 2005a. 'Friends and Relatives in Need of an Explanation: Gr. *anagkaíos*, L *necessarius* and PGmc *\*naud-*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 104: 1–11
- , 2005b. 'The Norse Origin of OE *afol* / ME *afell*: Is Evidence Strong Enough?', *English Language Notes*, 43: 1–8
- , 2006a. 'Anglo-Scandinavian Trade or Paganism? OE *hæden* in the First Cleopatra Glossary', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 101: 625–37
- , 2006b. 'OE *fēs(i)an* / ME *fēsen* Revisited', *Neophilologus*, 90: 119–34
- , 2006c. 'OE *māl* as a Gloss for L *clasma* in Aldhelmian Glossaries', *Notes and Queries*, 251: 395–98
- , 2006d. 'Sharpening, Confiding and OE *getrycād*', *Notes and Queries*, 251: 146–50
- , 2007a. 'An Etymological Note on Two Old English Medical Terms: *ridesoht* and *flagc*', *Studia Neophilologica*, 79: 45–53
- , 2007b. *Norse-Derived Vocabulary in Late Old English Texts: Wulfstan's Works, a Case Study*, North-Western European Language Evolution Supplement, 22 (Odense: University Press of Southern Denmark)
- , 2007c. 'A Paw in Every Pie: Wulfstan and the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle Again', *Leeds Studies in English*, n.s., 38: 31–52
- , 2007d. 'A Reconsideration of Wulfstan's Use of Norse-Derived Terms: The Case of *þræl*', *English Studies*, 88: 1–21
- , 2007e. 'Two Compounds in the Old English and Old Norse Versions of the *Prose Phoenix*', *Arkiv för nordisk filologi*, 122: 137–56

- , 2008. 'Norse-Derived Terms and Structures in *The Battle of Maldon*', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 107: 421–44
- , 2010. 'Norse-Derived Vocabulary in the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*', in *Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History*, ed. by Alice Jorgensen, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages*, 23 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 275–304
- , 2011. 'The Etymology of the Word-Field of Old English *hōre* and the Lexico-Cultural Climate of Eleventh-Century England', *Nottingham Medieval Studies*, 55: 23–48
- Pope, John C. (ed.). 1967–68. *Homilies of Ælfric: A Supplementary Collection*, Early English Text Society, o.s., 259 and 260, 2 vols (London: Oxford University Press)
- Porter, David W. 1995. 'The Hypocorism Bata – Old English or Latin?', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 96: 345–49
- , 1996. 'Ælfric's Colloquy and Ælfric Bata', *Neophilologus*, 80: 639–60
- , 1997. 'Introduction', in *Anglo-Saxon Conversations: The Colloquies of Ælfric Bata*, ed. by Scott Gwara and trans. by David W. Porter (Woodbridge: Boydell), pp. 1–76
- , 1999. 'On the Antwerp-London Glossaries', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 98: 170–92
- Poussa, Patricia. 1982. 'The Evolution of Early Standard English: The Creolization Hypothesis', *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 14: 69–85
- Pulsiano, Phillip. 2000. 'The Old English Gloss of the Eadwine Psalter', in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. by Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne, *Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England*, 30 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 166–94
- Prokosch, E. 1939. *A Comparative Germanic Grammar*, William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series (Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America)
- Pyles, Thomas, and John Algeo. 1993. *The Origins and Development of the English Language*, 4th edn (Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich)
- Rabin, Andrew. 2010. 'Evidence for Wulfstan's Authorship of the Old English *Að*', *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, 111: 43–54
- Ralph, Bo. 2002. 'Phonological and Graphemic Developments from Ancient Nordic to Old Nordic', in *The Nordic Languages: An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages*, ed. by Oskar Bandle and others, *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 22, 2 vols (Berlin: Gruyter, 2002–05), 1, 703–19
- Ramisch, Heinrich. 1997. 'Re-Examining the Influence of Scandinavian on English: The Case of ditch/dike', in *Language History and Linguistic Modelling: A Festschrift for Jacek Fisiak on his 60th Birthday*, ed. by Raymond Hickey and Stanislaw Puppel, *Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs*, 101, 2 vols (Berlin: Gruyter), 1: *Language History*, pp. 561–69
- Rasmussen, Jens Elmegård. 2000. 'The Growth of *i*-Umlaut in Norse and West Germanic: Thoughts on a Recent Book', *Acta Linguistica Hafniensia*, 32: 143–59
- Reimann, Max. 1883. *Die Sprache der mittellentischen Evangelien: Cod. Royal 1.A.14 und Hatton 38* (Berlin: Pormetter)
- Richards, Julian D., and others. 2004. 'Excavations at the Viking Barrow Cemetery at Heath Wood, Ingleby, Derbyshire', *Antiquaries Journal*, 84: 23–116

- Richards, Mary P. 1978. 'MS Cotton Vespasian A.XXII: The Vespasian Homilies', *Manuscripta*, 22: 97–103
- , 1981. 'The Medieval Hagiography of St. Neot', *Analecta Bollandiana*, 99: 259–78
- Ridel, E. 2000. 'Viking Maritime Heritage in Normandy from a British Isles Perspective', *Northern Studies*, 35: 79–94
- , (ed.). 2002. *L'héritage maritime des Vikings en Europe de l'ouest: Colloque international de la Hague (Flottemanville-Hague, 30 septembre – 3 octobre 1999)* (Caen: Presses universitaires de Caen)
- , 2004. 'The Linguistic Heritage of the Scandinavians in Normandy', in *Scandinavia and Europe 800–1350: Contact, Conflict, and Coexistence*, ed. by Jonathan Adams and Katherine Holman, *Medieval Texts and Cultures of Northern Europe*, 4 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 149–59
- , 2009. *Les Vikings et les mots: L'apport de l'ancien scandinave à la langue française* (Paris: Éditions Errance)
- Riedinger, Anita R. 1994. 'Lexical Inequities in Marriage: Old English *Wif*, *Wer* and *Husbonda*', *Studia Neophilologica*, 66: 3–14
- Riggert, Georg. 1909. 'Der syntaktische Gebrauch des Infinitivs in der altenglischen Poesie' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Königlichen Christian-Albrechts-Universität, Kiel)
- Riggs, Charles H., Jr. 1963. *Criminal Asylum in Anglo-Saxon Law*, University of Florida Monographs: Social Sciences, 18 (Gainesville: University of Florida Press)
- Rinelli, Gabriele. 2003. 'Scandinavian and Native Social Terms in Middle English: The Case of *Cherl* / *Carl*', in *Language Contact in the History of English*, ed. by Dieter Kastovsky and Arthur Mettinger, *Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature*, 1, 2nd edn (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang), pp. 267–77
- Ritt, Nikolaus. 2003. 'The Spread of Scandinavian Third Person Plural Pronouns in English: Optimisation, Adaptation and Evolutionary Stability', in *Language Contact in the History of English*, ed. by Dieter Kastovsky and Arthur Mettinger, *Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature*, 1, 2nd edn (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang), pp. 279–304
- Rix, Helmut. 1976. *Historische Grammatik des Griechischen: Laut- und Formlehre* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft)
- Rix, Helmut, and others (eds). 2001. *Lexikon der Indogermanischen Verben: Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen*, 2nd edn (Wiesbaden: Reichert)
- Roberts, Jane. 2000. 'The Old English Vocabulary of Nobility', in *Nobles and Nobility in Medieval Europe: Concepts, Origins, Transformations*, ed. by Anne J. Duggan (Woodbridge: Boydell), pp. 69–84
- Robertson, A. J. (ed. and trans.). 1925. *The Laws of the English Kings from Edmund to Henry I* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- , 1939. *Anglo-Saxon Charters* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Robinson, Fred C. 1965. 'Old English Lexicographical Notes', *Philologica Pragensia*, 8: 303–07
- , 1993. 'Some Aspects of the Maldon Poet's Artistry', in Fred C. Robinson, *The Tomb of Beowulf and Other Essays on Old English* (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 122–37 (first publ. in *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 75 (1976): 25–40)

- Rodger, N. A. M. 1995. 'Cnut's Geld and the Size of Danish Ships', *English Historical Review*, 110: 392–403
- Roe, H. A. 1967. 'A Note on Loanwords from Old Norse', *English Studies*, 48: 409–10
- Roesdhal, Else. 1982. *Viking Age Denmark*, trans. by Susan Margeson and Kirsten Williams (London: British Museum)
- Roffe, David. 1990. 'Domesday Book and Northern Society: A Reassessment', *English Historical Review*, 105: 310–36
- Rose-Troup, Frances. 1937. 'Exeter Manumissions and Quittances of the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association*, 69: 417–45
- Roslund, Mats. 1997. 'Crumbs from the Rich Man's Table: Byzantine Finds in Lund and Sigtuna, c. 980–1250', in *Visions of the Past: Trends and Traditions in Swedish Medieval Archaeology*, ed. by Hans Andersson and others, Lund Studies in Medieval Archaeology, 19 (Stockholm: Central Board of National Antiquities), pp. 239–97
- Ross, Alan S. C. 1933. 'Northumbrian "forwost"', *Acta Philologica Scandinavica*, 8: 146–79
- , 1937. *Studies in the Accidence of the Lindisfarne Gospels* (Kendal: Titus Wilson)
- , 1939–40. 'Old Norse Diphthongs in English', *Acta Philologica Scandinavica*, 14: 1–10
- , 1940. 'Four Examples of Norse Influence in the Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels', *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 39–52
- , 1970. 'Conservatism in the Anglo-Saxon Gloss to the Durham Ritual', *Notes and Queries*, 215: 363–66
- , 1978. 'A Point of Comparison between Aldred's Two Glosses', *Notes and Queries*, 223: 197–99
- , 1979a. 'Lindisfarne and Rushworth One', *Notes and Queries*, 224: 194–99
- , 1979b. 'Rare Words of Rushworth One', *Notes and Queries*, 224: 495–98
- , 1981. 'The Use of Other Latin Manuscripts by the Glossators of the Lindisfarne and Rushworth Gospels', *Notes and Queries*, 226, 6–11
- , 1982. 'Rare Words in Old Northumbrian', *Notes and Queries*, 227: 196–98
- Ross, Alan S. C., and J. B. Berns. 1992. 'Germanic', in *Indo-European Numerals*, ed. by Jadranka Gvozdanović, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 57 (Berlin: Gruyter), pp. 555–715
- Ross, Alan S. C., and others. 1956–60. 'Some Observations on the Gloss and the Glossator', in *Evangeliorum Quattuor Codex Lindisfarnensis: Musei Britannici Codex Cottonianus Nero D. IV*, ed. by T. D. Kendrick and others, 2 vols (Oltum: Urs Graf), II.2, pp. 5–33
- Rubin, Stanley. 1996. 'The Bot, or Composition in Anglo-Saxon Law: A Reassessment', *Journal of Legal History*, 17: 144–54
- Rumball, Jean. 2008. 'Anglo-Saxon Exile and Outlawry: A Philological and Historical Study' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge)
- Rumble, Alex (ed.). 1993. *Domesday Book*, xxxii: *Essex* (Chichester: Phillimore)
- Rusche, Philip Guthrie. 1996. 'The Cleopatra Glossaries: An Edition with Commentary on the Glosses and their Sources' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Yale University)

- Rushforth, Rebecca. 2008. *Saints in English Calendars before AD 1100*, Henry Bradshaw Society, 117 (London: Boydell)
- Rynell, Alarik. 1948. *The Rivalry of Scandinavian and Native Synonyms in Middle English Especially 'taken' and 'nimen'*, Lund Studies in English, 13 (Lund: Gleerup)
- Salmon, Vivian. 1960. "The Wanderer" and "The Seafarer", and the Old English Conception of the Soul', *Modern Language Review*, 55: 1–10
- Samnordisk runtextdatabas. Institutionen för nordiska språk <<http://www.nordiska.uu.se/forskn/samnord.htm>> [accessed from 9 September 2005 to 20 April 2007]
- Samuels, M. L. 1949. 'The *ge*-Prefix in the Old English Gloss to the Lindisfarne Gospels', *Transactions of the Philological Society*: 62–116
- , 1949–50. 'The Elder Edda and the Lindisfarne Gloss: A Syntactic Parallel', *English and Germanic Studies*, 3: 37–41
- , 1989. 'The Great Scandinavian Belt', in *Middle English Dialectology: Essays on Some Principles and Problems*, ed. by Angus McIntosh and others (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press), pp. 106–15 (first publ. in *Papers from the 4th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics, Amsterdam, 10–13 April 1985*, ed. by Roger Eaton and others, Amsterdam Studies in the Theory and History of Language Science, Series 4: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 41 (Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1985), pp. 269–81)
- Sandhal, Bertil. 1951–82. *Middle English Sea Terms*, Essays and Studies on English Language and Literature, 8 and 80, and Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis: Studia Anglistica Upsaliensia, 42, 3 vols (Uppsala: A.-B. Lundequistska Bokhandeln)
- Sandred, Karl I. 1966. 'On the Terminology of the Plough in England', *Studia Neophilologica*, 38: 323–38
- , 1997. 'The Value of Onomastic Boundaries in Dialect Studies: Focus on Some Medieval Norfolk Field-Names of Scandinavian Origin', in *Language in Time and Space: Studies in Honour of Wolfgang Viereck on the Occasion of his 60th Birthday*, ed. by Heinrich Ramisch and Kenneth Wynne, Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik: Beihefte, 97 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner), pp. 205–11
- Sarrazin, Gregor (ed.). 1885. *Octavian: zwei mittenglische Bearbeitungen der Sage*, Altenglische Bibliothek, 3 (Heilbronn: Henninger)
- Sauer, Hans. 1985. 'Lazamon's Compound Nouns and their Morphology', in *Historical Semantics: Historical Word-Formation*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 29 (Berlin: Mouton), pp. 483–532
- , 1992. *Nominalkomposita im Frühmittelenglischen: Mit Ausblicken auf die Geschichte der englischen Nominalkomposition* (Tübingen: Niemeyer)
- Sawyer, Birgit. 2000. *The Viking-Age Rune-Stones: Custom and Commemoration in Early Medieval Scandinavia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Sawyer, Peter H. (ed.). 1968. *Anglo-Saxon Charters: An Annotated List and Bibliography*, Royal Historical Society: Guides and Handbooks, 8 (London: Royal Historical Society). Online version, revised and updated, prepared by S. E. Kelly and S. M. Miller, <<http://www.trin.cam.ac.uk/sdk13/chartwww/eSawyer.99/eSawyer2.html>> [accessed from 10 October 2004 to 20 August 2011]



- , 1984. 'Ohthere and Viking Age Trade', in *Two Voyagers at the Court of King Alfred: The Ventures of Ohthere and Wulfstan Together with the Description of Northern Europe from the Old English Orosius*, ed. by Niels Lund and trans. by Christine E. Fell (York: Sessions), pp. 43–55
- , 1986. 'Anglo-Scandinavian Trade in the Viking Age and After', in *Anglo-Saxon Monetary History: Essays in Memory of Michael Dolley*, ed. by M. A. S. Blackburn (Leicester: Leicester University Press), pp. 185–99
- , 1987. 'The Process of Scandinavian Christianization in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', in *The Christianization of Scandinavia: Report of a Symposium Held at Kungälv, Sweden 4–9 August 1985*, ed. by Birgit Sawyer and others (Alingsås: Viktoria), pp. 68–87
- Sawyer, P. H., and others. 1969. 'The Two Viking Ages of Britain: A Discussion', *Medieval Scandinavia*, 2: 163–207
- Sayers, William. 1996. 'The Etymology and Semantics of Old Norse *knorr* "Cargo Ship"', *Scandinavian Studies*, 68: 279–90
- , 2003. 'Ships and Sailors in Geiffrei Gaimar's *Estoire des engleis*', *Modern Language Review*, 98: 299–310
- , 2004. 'Lexical and Literary Evidence for Medieval Trade in Precious Goods: Old French *rohal*, *roal*, Middle English *rouel* "Walrus (and narwhal?) Ivory"', *North-Western European Language Evolution*, 44: 101–19
- Scarfe Beckett, Katherine. 2003. *Anglo-Saxon Perceptions of the Islamic World*, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 33 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Scargill, Matthew Harry. 1940. 'The Phonology and Morphology of the Rushworth Gospels: Known as Rushworth1' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Leeds)
- Schiller, Karl, and August Lübken (eds). 1875–81. *Mittelniederdeutsches Wörterbuch*, 6 vols (Bremen: Kühtmann)
- Schipper, William. 1986. 'The Normans and the Old English Lives of Saint Giles and Saint Nicholas', *ICU Language Research Bulletin*, 1: 97–108
- Schlemilch, Willy. 1914. *Beiträge zur Sprache und Orthographie zur spätmittelengl. Sprachdenkmäler der Übergangszeit (1000–1150)*, Studien zur englischen Philologie, 34 (Halle: Niemeyer)
- Schlutter, Otto B. 1916. 'AE. *scinn* = ne. *shin* = nhd. *Schinne*', *Anglia*, 40: 260–62
- Schmid, Wolfgang P. 1980. 'Zur Etymologie des Wortes "Pflug"', *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen: philologische-historische Klasse*, 3rd ser. 116: 77–81
- Schmidt-Wiegand, R. 1991. 'Lex Salica', in *Lexikon des Mittelalters*, ed. by Robert Auty and others, 9 vols (München: Artemis, 1977–98), v, *Hiera-Mittel-Lukanien*, ed. by Robert-Henri Bautier and Charlotte Bretscher-Gisiger, pp. 1931–32
- Schück, Herman. 2003. 'Sweden under the Dynasty of the Folkungs', in *The Cambridge History of Scandinavia*, 1: *Prehistory to 1520*, ed. by Knut Helle (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 392–410
- Schultze-Thulin, Britta. 1996. 'Old Norse in Ireland', in *Language Contact across the North Atlantic: Proceedings of the Working Groups Held at University College, Galway (Ireland), August 29 – September 3, 1992 and the University of Göteborg (Sweden)*,

- August 16–21, 1993*, ed. by P. Sture Ureland and Iain Clarkson, *Linguistische Arbeiten*, 359 (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 83–113
- Schwammburger, Eduard. 1945. *Die Entwicklung der altenglischen Verben beodan und biddan zu neuenglisch to bid: eine lautliche, syntaktische und semantische Untersuchung* (Zurich: Aschman and Scheller)
- Schwytter, Jürg Rainer. 1996. *Old English Legal Language: The Lexical Field of Theft*, North-Western European Language Evolution Supplement, 15 (Odense: Odense University Press)
- Scott, John. 1981. *The Early History of Glastonbury: An Edition, Translation and Study of William of Malmesbury's 'De antiquitate Glastonie Ecclesie'* (Woodbridge: Boydell)
- Scragg, D. G. 1977. 'Napier 'Wulfstan' Homily XXX: Its Sources, its Relationship to the Vercelli Book and its Style', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 6: 197–211
- , 1979. 'The Corpus of Vernacular Homilies and Prose Saints' Lives before Ælfric', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 8: 223–77
- , (ed.). 1981. *The Battle of Maldon*, Old and Middle English Texts (Manchester: Manchester University Press)
- , 1991. 'The Battle of Maldon', in *The Battle of Maldon: AD 991*, ed. by Donald Scragg (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 15–36
- , (ed.). 1992. *The Vercelli Homilies and Related Texts*, Early English Text Society, o.s., 300 (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- , 1993. 'The Battle of Maldon: Fact or Fiction?', in *The Battle of Maldon: Fiction and Fact*, ed. by Janet Cooper (London: Hambledon), pp. 19–31
- See, Klaus von. 1964. *Altnordische Rechtswörter: philologische Studien zur Rechtsauffassung und Rechtsgesinnung der Germanen*, Hermanea: Germanische Forschungen, n.s., 16 (Tübingen: Niemeyer)
- , 1981. 'Húskarla hvöt. Nochmals zum Alter der Bjarkamál', in *Speculum Norroenum: Norse Studies in Memory of Gabriel Turville-Petre*, ed. by Ursula Dronke and others (Odense: Odense University Press), pp. 421–31
- Seebold, Elmar. 1966. 'Die ae. Schwundstufigen Präsentien (Aoristpräsentien) der ei-Reihe', *Anglia*, 84: 1–26
- , 1992. 'Kentish – And Old English Texts from Kent', in *Words, Texts and Manuscripts: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Culture Presented to Helmut Gneuss on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, ed. by Michael Korhammer and others (Cambridge: Brewer), pp. 409–44
- Serjeantson, Mary S. 1935. *A History of Foreign Words in English* (London: Kegan)
- [SGL =] *Corpus iuris Sueo-Gotorum antiqui: Samling af Sveriges gamla lagar*, ed. by D. C. J. Schlyter and D. H. S. Collin, 13 vols (Stockholm & Lund: Hæggström, 1827–77)
- Sharpe, Richard. 2003. 'The Use of Writs in the Eleventh Century', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 32: 247–91
- Sievers, E. 1887. 'Altnordische im Beowulf?', *Beiträge zur Geschichte der deutschen Sprache und Literatur*, 12: 168–200
- Simek, Rudolf. 1979. 'Old Norse Ship Names and Ship Terms', *Northern Studies*, 13: 26–36



- , 1982. *Die Schiffsnamen, Schiffsbezeichnungen und Schiffskennningar im Altnordischen*, Wiener Arbeiten zur germanischen Altertumskunde und Philologie, 14 (Wien: Halosar)
- Singh, Ishtla. 2005. *The History of English: A Student's Guide* (London: Hodder Arnold)
- Sisam, Kenneth. 1923. 'An Old English Translation of a Letter from Wynfrith to Eadburga (A.D. 716–717) in Cotton MS. Otho C. 1', *Modern Language Review*, 18: 253–72
- , 1953. *Studies in the History of Old English Literature* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Sisam, Kenneth, and Celia Sisam. 1958. 'The Psalm Texts', in *The Paris Psalter: MS. Bibliothèque Nationale Fonds Latin 8824*, ed. by Bertram Colgrave, *Early English Manuscripts in Facsimile*, 8 (København: Rosenkilde and Bagger), pp. 15–17
- , (eds). 1959. *The Salisbury Psalter: Edited from Salisbury Cathedral MS. 150*, *Early English Text Society*, o.s., 242 (London: Oxford University Press)
- Simmonds, Paula. 1984. 'Nautical Terms in the Brussels Glossary', in *Literature and Learning in Medieval and Renaissance England: Essays Presented to Fitzroy Pyle*, ed. by John Scattergood (Blackrock: Irish Academic Press), pp. 41–58
- Skaffari, Janne. 2002. 'The Non-Native Vocabulary of the *Peterborough Chronicle*', in *Middle English: From Tongue to Text: Selected Papers from the Third International Conference on Middle English: Language and Text, Held at Dublin, Ireland, 1–4 July 1999*, ed. by Peter J. Lucas and Angela M. Lucas, *Studies in English Medieval Language and Literature*, 4 (Frankfurt a.M.: Lang), pp. 235–46
- Skeat, Walter W. 1876. *A List of Words, the Etymology of Which is Illustrated by Comparison with Icelandic, Prepared in the Form of an Appendix to Cleasby and Vigfusson's Icelandic-English Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- , 1882. *A Concise Etymological Dictionary of the English Language* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- , 1892. *Principles of English Etymology*, 2nd edn, 2 vols (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- , 1893. 'Sunset', *Notes and Queries*, 8th ser. 4: 521
- , 1902. 'The Anglo-Saxon Fragments of the Eleventh Century', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society*, 61–63: 12–16
- Smith, A. H. (ed.). 1951. *The Parker Chronicle (832–900)*, 3rd edn (London: Methuen)
- Smith, A. H. 1970. *English Place-Name Elements*, *English Place-Name Society*, 25 and 26 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Smith, Jeremy. 1996. *An Historical Study of English: Function, Forms and Change* (London: Routledge)
- Smith, Laura Catherine. 1997. 'Holtzmann's Law: Getting to the Hart of the Germanic Verschärfung' (unpublished master's thesis, University of Calgary)
- , 1999. 'What's All the Fuss about 16 Words? A New Approach to Holtzmann's Law', *Calgary Working Papers in Linguistics*, 21: 66–95
- Snædal, Thorgunn. 2002. *Medan världen vakar: studier i de gotländska runinskrifternas språk och kronologi*, *Runrön*, 16 (Uppsala: Institutionen för nordiska språk, University of Uppsala)
- Söderberg, Sven, and Erik Brate (eds). 1900–06. *Ölands runinskrifter*, *Sveriges runinskrifter*, 1 (Stockholm: Norstedt)

- Souter, Alexander (ed.). 1949. *A Glossary of Later Latin to 600 AD* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Spargo, John Webster. 1940. 'Chaucer's Love-Days', *Speculum*, 15: 36–56
- Speed, Greg, and Penelope Walton Rogers. 2004. 'A Burial of a Viking Woman at Adwick-le-Street, South Yorkshire', *Medieval Archaeology*, 48: 51–90
- Splett, Jochen (ed.). 1993. *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch*, 2 vols (Berlin: Gruyter)
- Stafford, Pauline. 1978. 'The Reign of Æthelred II, A Study in the Limitations on Royal Policy and Action', in *Ethelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference*, ed. by David Hill, BAR British Series, 59 (Oxford: BAR), pp. 15–46
- , 1985. *The East Midlands in the Early Middle Ages*, Studies in the Early History of Britain (Leicester: Leicester University Press)
- , 1999. 'Ealdormann', in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. by Michael Lapidge and others (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 152–53
- , 2006. 'Chronicle D, 1067 and Women: Gendering Conquest in Eleventh-Century England', in *Anglo-Saxons: Studies Presented to Cyril Roy Hart*, ed. by Simon Keynes and Alfred P. Smyth (Dublin: Four Courts), pp. 208–23
- Stanley, E. G. 1969. 'Old English "-calla", "ceallian"', in *Medieval Literature and Civilization: Studies in Memory of G. N. Garmonsway*, ed. by Derek A. Pearsall and R. A. Waldron (London: Athlone), pp. 94–99
- , 1979. 'Two Old English Poetic Phrases Insufficiently Understood for Literary Criticism: *þing gebegan* and *seonop gebegan*', in *Old English Poetry: Essays on Style*, ed. by Daniel G. Calder (Berkeley: University of California Press), pp. 67–90
- , 1983. 'Early Middle English "oc" = "but, and"', in *Five Hundred Years of Words and Sounds: A Festschrift for Eric Dobson*, ed. by E. G. Stanley and Douglas Gray (Cambridge: Brewer), pp. 144–50
- , 1995. 'Owen Manning 1. on Old English *æstel* and 2. on the Aldbrough Inscription', *Notes and Queries*, 240: 10–13
- , 2000. *Imagining the Anglo-Saxon Past: The Search for Anglo-Saxon Paganism and Anglo-Saxon Trial by Jury* (Cambridge: Brewer)
- , 2001. 'Linguistic Self-Awareness at Various Times in the History of English from Old English Onwards', in *Lexis and Texts in Early English: Studies Presented to Jane Roberts*, ed. by Christian J. Kay and Louise M. Sylvester, Costerus, n.s., 133 (Amsterdam: Rodopi), pp. 237–54
- , 2002. 'Palaeographical and Textual Deep Waters: <a> for <u> and <u> for <a>, <d> for <ð> and <ð> for <d> in Old English', *American Notes and Queries*, 15.2: 64–72
- Stanton, Robert. 2002. *The Culture of Translation in Anglo-Saxon England* (Cambridge: Brewer)
- Stark, Detlef. 1982. *The Old English Weak Verbs: A Diachronic and Synchronic Analysis*, Linguistische Arbeiten, 112 (Tübingen: Niemeyer)
- Steenstrup, Johannes C. H. R. 1882. *Normannerne*, 4 vols (København: Klein, 1876–82), iv: *Danelag*
- Stenton, F. M. 1927. *Danes in England*, The Raleigh Lecture on History, Proceedings of the British Academy, 13 (London: Oxford University Press)

- , 1961. *The First Century of English Feudalism 1066–1166: Being the Ford Lectures Delivered in the University of Oxford in Hilary Term 1929*, 2nd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- , 1971. *Anglo-Saxon England*, 3rd edn (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Stephenson, Rebecca. 2006. 'Ælfric of Eynsham and Hermeneutic Latin: *Meatim sed et rustica* Reconsidered', *Journal of Medieval Latin*, 16: 111–41
- Stevenson, W. H. 1887. 'Molmen', *English Historical Review*, 2: 332–36
- , 1912. 'Yorkshire Surveys and Other Eleventh-Century Documents in the York Gospels', *English Historical Review*, 27: 1–25
- Stokes, Peter Anthony. 2005. 'English Vernacular Script, ca 990 – ca 1035' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge)
- Strid, Jan Paul. 1987. 'Runic Swedish Thegns and Drengs', in *Runor och runinskrifter: Föredrag vid riksantikvarieämbetets och vitterhetsakademiens symposium 8–11 september 1985*, Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien: Konferenser, 15 (Stockholm: Almqvist), pp. 301–16
- Ström, Folke. 1942. *On the Sacral Origin of the Germanic Death Penalties*, Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademiens Handlingar, 52 (Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand)
- Stubbs, Michael. 1986. *Educational Linguistics* (Oxford: Blackwell)
- Sturtevant, Albert Morey. 1921. 'Zum vokalismus des gotischen and-waihando, Röm 7, 23, in seinem Verhältnis zu altisländischem vega "töten"', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 20: 22–27
- Sullivan, David. 1994. *The Westminster Corridor: An Exploration of the Anglo-Saxon History of Westminster Abbey and its Nearby Lands and People* (London: Historical Publications)
- Swan, Mary. 2006. 'Old English Textual Activity in the Reign of Henry II', in *Writers of the Reign of Henry II: Twelve Essays*, ed. by Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones, The New Middle Ages (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 151–68
- Svensson, Ann-Marie. 1997. *Middle English Words for 'Town': A Study of Changes in a Semantic Field*, Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis: Gothenburg Studies in English, 70 (Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis)
- Swanton, M. J. 1999. 'King Alfred's Ships: Text and Context', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 28: 1–22
- , (trans. and ed.). 2000. *The Anglo-Saxon Chronicles*, new edn (London: Phoenix)
- Sweet, Henry. 1896. *The Student's Dictionary of Anglo-Saxon* (Oxford: Oxford University Press)
- Syrett, Martin. 1994. *The Unaccented Vowels of Proto-Norse*, North-Western European Language Evolution Supplement, 11 (Odense: Odense University Press)
- , 2000. 'Drengs and Thegns Again', *Saga-Book of the Viking Society for Northern Research*, 25: 243–71
- , 2002. *The Vikings in England: The Evidence of Runic Inscriptions*, ASNC Guides, Texts and Studies, 2 (Cambridge: Department of Anglo-Saxon, Norse and Celtic)
- Szogs, Arthur. 1931. *Die Ausdrücke für 'Arbeit' und 'Beruf' im Altenglischen*, Anglistische Forschungen, 73 (Heidelberg: Winter)

- Tadmor, Uri. 2009. 'Loanwords in the World's Languages', in *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*, ed. by Martin Haspelmath and Uri Tadmor (Den Haag: Mouton de Gruyter), pp. 55–75
- Tatton-Brown, Tim. 1984. 'The Towns of Kent', in *Anglo-Saxon Towns in Southern England*, ed. by Jerey Haslam (Chichester: Phillimore), pp. 1–13
- Tengvik, Gösta. 1938. *Old English Bynames*, Nomina Germanica: Arkiv för germansk namnforskning utgivet av Jöran Sahlgren, 4 (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells)
- Tenhaken, Hans P. 1979. *Das northumbrische Priestergezet: ein nachwulfstanisches Pönitential des 11. Jarhunderts*, Düsseldorf Hochschulreihe, 4 (Düsseldorf: Stern)
- Thier, Katrin. 2000a. 'The Cobles: Celtic Boats in Anglo-Saxon Northumbria?', *The Mariner's Mirror*, 86: 131–39
- , 2000b. 'Old English Ship Terms and their Scandinavian Parallels – the Evidence Reviewed', Poster presented at the 11th International Conference on English Historical Linguistics, Santiago de Compostela, Spain, 7–11 September
- , 2002. *Altenglische Terminologie für Schiffe und Schiffsteile: Archäologie und Sprachgeschichte 500–1100*, BAR International Series, 1036 (Oxford: Archaeopress)
- , 2009. 'Ships and their Terminology between England and the North', in *Anglo-Saxons and the North: Essays Reflecting the Theme of the 10th Meeting of the International Society of Anglo-Saxonists in Helsinki, August 2001*, ed. by Matti Kilpiö and others, Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 364 (Tempe: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies), pp. 151–64
- Thorn, Frank, and Caroline Thorn (eds). 1979. *Domesday Book*, VI: *Wiltshire* (Chichester: Phillimore)
- Tinti, Francesca. 2010. *Sustaining Belief: The Church of Worcester from c. 870 to c. 1100* (Farnham: Ashgate)
- Thomason, Sarah Grey. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)
- Thomason, Sarah Grey, and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics* (Berkeley: University of California Press)
- Thompson, Victoria. 2004. *Dying and Death in Later Anglo-Saxon England*, Anglo-Saxon Studies, 4 (Woodbridge: Boydell)
- Thomson, R. L. 1957. 'Three Etymological Notes', *English and Germanic Studies*, 6: 79–91
- Thors, Carl-Eric. 1957. *Den kristna terminologien i fornsvenskan*, Studier i nordisk filologi, 45 (Helsingfors: Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland)
- Thorson, Per. 1936. *Anglo-Norse Studies: An Enquiry into the Scandinavian Elements in the Modern English Dialects* (Amsterdam: Swets and Zeitlinger)
- Tiersma, Peter Meijes. 1999. *Legal Language* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press)
- [TOE =] *A Thesaurus of Old English*, ed. by Jane Roberts and others, 2 vols (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000)
- Tolkien, J. R. R. 1981. *The Old English Exodus: Text, Translation and Commentary*, ed. by Joan Turville-Petre (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Toller, T. Northcote. 1921. *An Anglo-Saxon Dictionary: Supplement* (London: Lowe and Bryndone)

- Toon, Thomas E. 1976. 'The Actuation and Implementation of an Old English Sound Change', *Proceedings of the Linguistic Association of Canada and the United States*, 3: 614–22
- Toswell, M. Jane. 1990. 'Studies in the Paris Psalter, Metrical Version' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Oxford)
- Toth, Karl. 1984. 'Altenglische Interlinearglossen zu Prosper's Epigrammata und Versus ad coniugem', *Anglia*, 102: 1–36
- Townend, Matthew. 2000a. 'Pre-Cnut Praise Poetry in Viking Age England', *Review of English Studies*, n.s., 51: 349–70
- , 2000b. 'Viking Age England as a Bilingual Society', in *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, ed. by Dawn M. Hadley and Julian D. Richards, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages*, 2 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 89–105
- , 2001. 'Contextualizing the Knútsdrápur: Skaldic Praise-Poetry at the Court of Cnut', *Anglo-Saxon England*, 30: 145–79
- , 2002. *Language and History in Viking Age England: Linguistic Relations between Speakers of Old Norse and Old English*, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages*, 6 (Turnhout: Brepols)
- Trafford, Simon. 2000. 'Ethnicity, Migration Period and the Historiography of the Scandinavian Settlement in England', in *Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, ed. by Dawn M. Hadley and Julian D. Richards, *Studies in the Early Middle Ages*, 2 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 17–39
- Treharne, Elaine. 1997. *The Old English Life of St Nicholas with the Old English Life of St Giles*, *Leeds Texts and Monographs*, n.s., 15 (Leeds: School of English)
- , 2000. 'The Production and Script of Manuscripts Containing English Religious Texts in the First Half of the Twelfth Century', in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. by Mary Swan and Elaine Treharne, *Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England*, 30 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 11–40
- , 2001. 'English in the Post-Conquest Period', in *A Companion to Anglo-Saxon Literature*, ed. by Phillip Pulsiano and Elaine Treharne, *Blackwell Companions to Literature and Culture*, 11 (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 403–14
- , 2006a. 'Categorization, Periodization: The Silence of (the) English in the Twelfth Century', *New Medieval Literatures*, 8: 247–73
- , 2006b. 'The Life of English in the Mid-Twelfth Century: Ralph D'Escures' Homily on the Virgin Mary', in *Writers of the Reign of Henry II: Twelve Essays*, ed. by Ruth Kennedy and Simon Meecham-Jones, *The New Middle Ages* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan), pp. 261–84
- Trilling, Renée R. 2007. 'Sovereignty and Social Order: Archbishop Wulfstan and the Institutes of Polity', in *The Bishop Reformed: Studies of Episcopal Power and Culture in the Central Middle Ages*, ed. by John S. Ott and Anna Trumbore Jones (Aldershot: Ashgate), pp. 58–85



- Trillmich, Werner, and Rudolph Buchner (ed. and trans.). 1961. *Quellen des 9. und 11. Jahrhunderts zur Geschichte der hamburgischen Kirche und des Reiches*, Ausgewählte Quellen zur deutschen Geschichte des Mittelalters, 11 (Berlin: Rütten & Loening)
- Trips, Carola. 2002. *From OV to VO in Early Middle English*, Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today (Amsterdam: Benjamins)
- Tristram, Hildegard L. C. 1970. 'Vier altenglische Predigten aus der heterodoxen Tradition, mit Kommentar, Übersetzung und Glossar sowie drei weiteren Texten im Anhang' (unpublished doctoral thesis, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität, Freiburg i.Br.)
- Trudgill, Peter. 1986. *Dialects in Contact*, Language in Society, 10 (Oxford: Blackwell)
- Tschan, Francis J. (trans.). 2002. *History of the Archbishops of Bremen: Adam of Bremen*, 2nd edn with an Introduction and Selected Bibliography by Timothy Reuter (New York: Columbia University Press)
- Turner, Ralph V. 1968. 'The Origins of the Medieval English Jury: Frankish, English, or Scandinavian?', *Journal of British Studies*, 7.2: 1–10
- Turville-Petre, E. O. G. 1976. *Skaldic Poetry* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Underwood, Richard. 1999. *Anglo-Saxon Weapons and Warfare* (Stroud: Tempus)
- Ungerer, Friedrich, and Hans-Jörg Schmid. 2006. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics* (Harlow: Pearson Education)
- Ure, James M. (ed.). 1957. *The Benedictine Office: An Old English Text* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)
- Vaan, Michiel de. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*, Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary Series, 7 (Leiden: Brill)
- Valtonen, Irmeli. 2008. *The North in the 'Old English Orosius': A Geographical Narrative in Context*, Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique de Helsinki, 73 (Helsinki: Société Néophilologique)
- Vázquez González, Juan Gabriel. 2004. 'On the Limits of Lexical Reconstruction: Old English *yrfan*', in *Voices on the Past: Studies in Old and Middle English Language and Literature*, ed. by Alicia Rodríguez Álvarez and Francisco Alonso Almeida ([n.p.]: Netbiblo), pp. 139–47
- Vendryes, J., and others (eds). 1974–. *Lexique étymologique de l'irlandais ancien* (Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies)
- Vennemann, Theo. 1997. 'Zur Etymologie der Sippe von engl. *Knife*, franz. *Canif*, bask. *Kaniber*', North-Western European Language Evolution, 31–32: 439–62
- [VEPN =] *The Vocabulary of English Place-Names*, ed. by David N. Parsons and others (Nottingham: Centre for English Name-Studies, 1997–)
- Verwijs, E. and others (eds). 1885–1952. *Middelnederlandsch woordenboek*, 11 vols (Den Haag: Nijhoff)
- Vinogradoff, Paul. 1906–07. 'Transfer of Land in Old English Law', *Harvard Law Review*, 20: 532–48
- , 1908. *English Society in the Eleventh Century: Essays in English Medieval History* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Vries, Jan de (ed.). 1961. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Leiden: Brill)
- , (ed.). 1971. *Nederlands etymologisch Woordenboek* (Leiden: Brill)

- Waldron, Ronald. 1991. 'Dialect Aspects of Manuscripts of Trevisa's Translation of the *Polychronicon*', in *Regionalism in Late Medieval Manuscripts and Texts: Essays Celebrating the Publication of A Linguistic Atlas of Late Mediaeval English*, ed. by Felicity Riddy (Cambridge: Brewer), pp. 67–87
- Wall, Arnold. 1898. 'A Contribution towards the Study of the Scandinavian Element in the English Dialects', *Anglia*, 20: 45–135
- Wall, John. 1997. 'Anglo-Saxon Sundials in Ryedale', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, 69: 93–117
- Wallace, P. F. 1987. 'The Economy and Commerce of Viking Age Dublin', in *Der Untersuchungen zu Handel und Verkehr der vor- und frühgeschichtlichen Zeit in Mittel- und Nordeuropa*, ed. by Klaus Düwel and others, 6 vols (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1985–97), iv: *Der Handel der Karolinger- und Wikingerzeit*, pp. 200–45
- Warner, Rubie D. N. (ed.). 1917. *Early English Homilies from the Twelfth-Century Ms. Vesp. D. XIV*, Early English Text Society, o.s., 152 (London: Paul)
- Watkin, Aelred (ed.). 1947–56. *The Great Charters of Glastonbury*, Somerset Record Society, 59, 63 and 64, 3 vols (Frome: Butler and Tanner)
- Watts, Lorna, and others. 1997. 'Kirkdale – The Inscriptions', *Medieval Archaeology*, 41: 51–99
- Watts, Victor. 1988–89. 'Scandinavian Settlement Names in County Durham', *Nomina*, 12: 17–63
- , 1995. 'Northumberland and Durham: The Place-Name Evidence', in *Scandinavian Settlement in Northern Britain: Thirteen Studies of Place-Names in their Historical Context*, ed. by Barbara Crawford (London: Leicester University Press), pp. 206–13
- Watts, Victor, and others (eds). 2004. *The Cambridge Dictionary of English Place-Names: Based on the Collections of the English Place-Name Society* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1963. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*, with a Preface by André Martinet (Den Haag: Mouton)
- Welna, Jerzy. 1980. 'On Gender Change in Linguistic Borrowing (Old English)', in *Historical Morphology*, ed. by Jacek Fisiak, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, 17 (Den Haag: Gruyter), pp. 399–420
- , 2004. 'Spirantisation and despirantisation', in *New Perspectives on English Historical Linguistics: Selected Papers from 12 ICEHL, Glasgow, 21–26 August 2002*, ed. by Christian Kay and others, Amsterdam Studies in the History and Theory of Linguistic Science, Series 4: Current Issues in Linguistic Theory, 252, 2 vols (Amsterdam: Benjamins), II: *Lexis and Transmission*, pp. 251–65
- Wennström, Torsten. 1933. *Fredlösheten: Några rättshistoriska och filologiska synpunkter*, Vetenskaps-Societeten i Lund Årsbok, 1 (Lund: Gleerup)
- Werner, Otmar. 1991. 'The Incorporation of Old Norse Pronouns into Middle English', in *Language Contact in the British Isles: Proceedings of the Eighth International Symposium in Europe, Douglas, Isle of Man*, ed. by Sture Ureland and George Broderick (Tübingen: Niemeyer), pp. 369–401



- Wessén, Elias. 1965. *Svensk språkhistoria*, 11: *Ordbildningslära*, Nordiskt kursbibliotek (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell)
- Wessén, Elias, and S. B. F. Jansson (eds). 1940–58. *Upplands runinskrifter*, Sveriges runinskrifter, 6–9 (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell)
- West, F. J. 1959. 'An Early Justiciar's Writ', *Speculum*, 34: 631–35
- Westlake, H. F. 1919. *The Parish Gilds of Medieval England* (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: Macmillan)
- Widmark, Gun. 1959. *Det nordiska u-omljudet: en dialektgeografisk undersökning*, Skrifter utgivna av Institutionen för nordiska språk vid Uppsala Universitet, 6, 2 vols (Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells)
- , 2001. *Det språk som blev vårt: Ursprung och utveckling i svenskan: Urtid-Runtid-Riddartid*, Acta Academiae Regiae Gustavi Adolphi, 76 (Uppsala: Kungl. Gustav Adolfs Akademien för svensk folkkultur)
- Whitelock, Dorothy (ed. and trans.). 1930. *Anglo-Saxon Wills*, Cambridge Studies in English Legal History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- , (ed.). 1939. *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* (London: Methuen)
- , 1941. 'Wulfstan and the So-Called Laws of Edward and Guthrum', *English Historical Review*, 56: 1–21
- , 1959. 'The Dealings of the Kings of England with Northumbria in the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries', in *The Anglo-Saxons: Studies in Some Aspects of their History and Culture Presented to Bruce Dickins*, ed. by Peter Clemoes (London: Bowes), pp. 70–88
- , 1965. 'Wulfstan at York', in *Medieval and Linguistic Studies in Honour of Francis Peabody Magoun*, ed. by Jess B. Bessinger and Robert P. Creed (London: Allen), pp. 214–31
- , (ed.). 1976. *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*, rev. edn (Exeter: University of Exeter)
- , (ed.). 1979. *English Historical Documents c. 500–1042*, English Historical Documents, 1, 2nd edn (London: Eyre Methuen; New York: Oxford University Press)
- Whitelock, Dorothy, and others (eds). 1965. *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: A Revised Translation*, 2nd edn (London: Eyre)
- Williams, Ann. 1986. '“Cockles amongst the Wheat”: Danes and English in the Western Midlands in the First Half of the Eleventh Century', *Midland History*, 11: 1–22
- , 1999. 'Leofric', in *The Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Anglo-Saxon England*, ed. by Michael Lapidge and others (Oxford: Blackwell), p. 282
- Wilcox, Jonathan. 1987. 'The Compilation of Old English Homilies in MSS Cambridge, Corpus Christi College, 419 and 421' (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Cambridge)
- , 1991. 'Napier's 'Wulfstan' Homilies XL and XLII: Two Anonymous Works from Winchester?', *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 90: 1–19
- , 1992. 'The Dissemination of Wulfstan's Homilies: The Wulfstan Tradition in Eleventh-Century Vernacular Preaching', in *England in the Eleventh Century: Proceedings of the 1990 Harlaxton Symposium*, ed. by Carola Hicks, Harlaxton Medieval Studies, 2 (Stamford: Whitkins), pp. 199–217

- , 1995. 'The Battle of Maldon and the *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, 979–1016: A Winning Combination', *Proceedings of the Medieval Association of the Midwest*, 3: 31–50
- , 2000. 'Wulfstan and the Twelfth Century', in *Rewriting Old English in the Twelfth Century*, ed. by Mary Swan and Elaine M. Treharne, Cambridge Studies in Anglo-Saxon England, 30 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 83–97
- , 2004. 'Wulfstan's *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos* as Political Performance: 16 February 1014 and Beyond', in *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, ed. by Matthew Townend, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 10 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 375–96
- Wilson, H. A. (ed.). 1896. *The Missal of Robert of Jumièges*, Henry Bradshaw Society, 11 (London: Henry Bradshaw Society)
- Wilson, R. M. 1970. *The Lost Literature of Medieval England*, 2nd edn (London: Methuen)
- Winford, Donald. 2005. 'Contact-Induced Changes: Classification and Processes', *Dialectronica*, 22: 373–427
- Wollmann, Alfred. 1990. *Untersuchungen zu den frühen lateinischen Lehnwörtern im Altenglischen*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur englischen Philologie, 15 (München: Fink)
- , 1996. 'Scandinavian Loanwords in Old English', in *The Origins and Development of Emigrant Languages: Proceedings of the Second Rasmus Rask Colloquium*, Odense University, November 1994, ed. by Hans F. Nielsen and Lene Schøsler, North-Western European Language Evolution Supplement, 17 (Odense: Odense University Press), pp. 215–42
- Wood, Francis A. 1903. 'Etymological Notes', *Modern Language Review*, 18: 13–18
- , 1913. *Some Parallel Formations in English*, Hesperia, Ergänzungsreihe, Schriften zur englischen Philologie, 1 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press)
- , 1920. 'Germanic *w*-Gemination', *Modern Philology*, 18: 78–92 and 303–08
- Woolf, Rosemary. 1968. *The English Religious Lyric in the Middle Ages* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Wormald, Patrick. 1978. 'Æthelred the Lawmaker', in *Ethelred the Unready: Papers from the Millenary Conference*, ed. by David Hill, BAR, British Series, 59 (Oxford: BAR), pp. 47–80
- , 1999. *The Making of English Law: King Alfred to the Twelfth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell), 1: *Legislation and Limits*
- , 2000. 'Archbishop Wulfstan and the Holiness of Society', in Patrick Wormald, *Anglo-Saxon History: Basic Readings*, Basic Readings in Anglo-Saxon England, 6 (New York: Garland), pp. 191–224 (first publ. in Patrick Wormald, *Legal Culture in the Early Medieval West: Law as Text, Image and Experience* (London: Hambledon, 1999), pp. 225–51)
- , 2004. 'Archbishop Wulfstan: Eleventh-Century State-BUILDER', in *Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, ed. by Matthew Townend, Studies in the Early Middle Ages, 10 (Turnhout: Brepols), pp. 9–27
- Worsaae, J. J. A. 1851. *Minder om de Danske og Nordmændene i England, Skotland og Irland* (København: Reitzel)

- , 1863. *Den danske Erobring af England og Normandiet* (København: Gyldendal)
- Wright, William Aldis (ed.). 1887. *Metrical Chronicle of Robert of Gloucester*, *Rerum britannicarum medii ævii scriptores*, 86 (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode)
- Würth, Stefanie. 2002. 'The Sources of the Transitional Period between Ancient Nordic and Old Nordic', in *The Nordic Languages: An International Handbook of the History of the North Germanic Languages*, ed. by Oskar Bandle and others, *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft*, 22, 2 vols (Berlin: Gruyter, 2002–05), 1, 698–73
- Yerkes, David (ed.). 1984. 'The Old Norse and Old English Prose Accounts of the Phoenix', *Journal of English Linguistics*, 17: 24–28
- Zöega, Geir T. (ed.). 1910. *A Concise Dictionary of Old Icelandic* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)
- Zupitza, Julius. 1886. 'Kleine Bemerkungen zu Skeats *Etymological Dictionary*', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen*, 76: 205–18
- Zupko, Ronald Edward. 1968. *A Dictionary of English Weights and Measures: From Anglo-Saxon Times to the Nineteenth Century* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press)

## WORD INDEX

The languages represented in this index are organised as follows: English terms are given first. They are followed by Scandinavian terms, and then terms belonging to other Germanic languages. Terms belonging to other Indo-European languages are listed afterwards. Terms belonging to non-Indo-European languages are listed at the end.

### 1. *English Terms*

#### Old English

Words are arranged alphabetically, although the prefix <ge-> should be discounted (as is the case for ME *i-*). <æ> is considered to be equivalent to <ae>, and <ð> and <þ> are given after <t>. Collocations including a verb are listed under the verb; collocations where two items are coordinated are given under the first item, while noun phrases with a head and a modifier are given under the head.

*ac*: 119–20

*ācwellan*: 494 n. 16

*æbebod*: 158

*æbod*: 158

*æd* (*æt*): 415

*æfnan*: 93

\**ægne*: 495

*æhīwe*: 224

*æhtwela*: 235

*ælagol*: 85, 126, 128, 138, 140, 156,  
157–59, 307

*æled*: 89

*ælding*: 89, 12, 126, 128, 144, 146, 225, 281

*ælmesmann*: 414

*ælmes*(*se*) (*ælmys*(*se*)): 420

*ænglisc*: 205

*ær*: 73–74

*ærende*: 406

*ærendraca*: 238

*ærendsecg*: 238

*æring*: 73, 267

*ærfle* (*?*, *erfle?*, *erfel?*): 89, 126, 128, 144,  
146, 218, 223–24, 225, 243, 281

*ærlice*: 73

*ærn*: 62, 105

*ærra*: 242

*æsc*: 203, 204–05, 416

*æschere*: 416

*æscmann*: 205, 416

*æslitend*: 86, 162

*ætfeŋg*: 170

*ætsacan*: 165

*ædele*: 3 n. 3

*æ(w)*: 85, 157, 158–59, 174, 208, 377, 479  
*butan æ*: 87, 174

*æwbræca*: 85

- æwbræce*: 85  
*æwbryce*: 85  
*æwe*: 159  
*æ(w)lic*: 85, 157  
*æx*: 199  
*afol*: 93, 429  
*afublic*: 253, 419, 468  
*āgan (abte)*: 429  
*ālegan*: 448, 449  
*‘almahtig’ (nWS)*: 49  
*almus*: 419–20  
*āmānsomad*: 172 n. 36  
*ambeht (ambiht, embeht, embiht)*: 420, 423  
*ān*: 429  
*andefen*: 93  
*andfeng*: 237  
*andswarian*: 251  
*andweorc*: 232  
*andwyrðan*: 251  
*ānlaga*: 95, 429  
*ānliepe*: 429  
*antimber*: 232  
*ānum*: 42  
*ār (‘early’)*: 73–74, 89, 126, 129, 134, 152, 241, 253, 255, 257, 267, 269, 282  
*ār (‘messenger’)*: 238  
*ārædnes*: 182  
*ār(e)we*: 400  
*argscipe (Nb.)*: 400  
*ārlic*: 73, 126, 129, 134, 241, 253, 255, 257, 267, 269, 282  
*ārlice*: 73, 126, 129, 134, 241, 253, 255, 257, 267, 269, 282  
*ārloc*: 207  
*ārmidl*: 207  
*ārmorgen*: 73, 126, 129, 134, 241, 253, 255, 257, 267, 269, 282  
*ārmorgenlic*: 73, 126, 129, 134, 241, 253, 255, 257, 267, 269, 282  
*ārwiððe*: 207  
*āsceacan*: 174  
*āscylan (āscilian)*: 404  
*āsetnes*: 85, 158  
*āsettan of*: 456  
*ātēon*: 247  
  
*bā*: 90  
*bād*: 171  
*bælc (‘covering’)*: 401, 429–30  
  
*bælc (‘swelling’)*: 430  
*bældo*: 227, 267  
*gebæte(l)*: 236  
*balc*: 401  
*balca*: 401, 430  
*band*: 72, 126, 128, 144, 146, 152, 218, 282  
*barð(a)*: 50, 59, 62, 126, 128, 138–40, 201–02, 204–05, 282–83  
*bāt*: 2 n. 2, 201  
*bātswegen*: 2 n. 2, 30 n. 10, 218 n. 88  
*bāðe*: 89–90, 126, 127, 129, 144, 146, 152, 283, 490  
*be*: 417  
*beald*: 227  
*bēatan*: 239  
*bebod*: 158–59  
*gebed*: 488  
*bedd*: 226, 256, 267, 268  
*befōn*: 240 n. 105  
*beheawan*: 455  
*bēn*: 488  
*bend*: 72  
*bēodende (‘budende’)*: 98  
*bēon*: 173  
*beorg*: 446  
*beran ūp māl*: 47, 126, 128, 145, 147, 156 n. 15, 163–64, 405  
*berēofan*: 453  
*gebētan*: 230  
*bicce*: 110, 220  
*biddan*: 430  
*bigleofa*: 187  
*bigwist*: 187  
*bindan*: 72, 107  
*bīsen*: 158  
*boda*: 238, 492  
*bolster*: 453  
*bōn*: 431  
*bōnda (‘bunda’)*: 106–07, 126, 128, 139–40, 142–43, 145, 147, 209–10, 215–16, 283  
*bōndeland*: 107, 126, 128, 144, 146, 209, 283  
*gebōnod*: 430–31  
*bord*: 50  
*borg*: 160, 169, 171, 177–78  
*borhhand*: 169  
*bōt*: 431  
*bōtlēas*: 431  
*bōtwyrðe*: 431  
*brād*: 398–99

- brādæx*: 199  
*brādhlāf*: 398  
*brādlāstæx*: 199  
*bræd*: 398  
*brædan*: 226 n. 94  
*bræding*: 226, 267  
*bræsen*: 227  
*bregdan hine sēcne*: 431  
*brōd*: 408  
*bryce*: 115, 116  
*brycg*: 407  
*brȳd*: 31, 268  
*brȳdealu*: 185, 248–50  
*brȳdhlōp*: 27, 31, 89, 126, 128, 134, 144, 145  
 (Table 14, first note), 146, 156, 182, 185,  
 241, 248–50, 252, 255, 267–69, 284  
*bryne*: 482  
*brynige*: 62, 89, 126, 128, 138, 140, 144,  
 146, 152, 198, 284, 481  
*bryttan*: 117  
*bū*: 421  
*būan* (*bȳa*, Nb.): 106, 107, 421  
*būend*: 106  
*buƿan*: 489  
*gebūnes*: 421  
*burhbryce*: 116  
*burhlagu*: 85, 126, 128, 138, 140, 156,  
 157–59, 307  
*burhriht*: 85  
*burhsæta*: 42  
*būte*: 51 n. 54  
*būtsecarl*: 51, 126, 128, 145, 147, 192,  
 194–96, 284  
*bȳ*: 420–21  
*byht*: 421  
*gebyhð*: 421  
*bylg*: 430  
*byrne*: 62  
  
*cāl*: 409–10  
*cald* (Angl.): 217  
*cann*: 432  
*carl*: 50–52, 126, 128  
*carlfugol*: 3, 51, 110, 126, 128, 144, 146,  
 218–20, 243, 278, 284, 378  
*carlmann*: 51, 126, 128, 144, 146, 218–19,  
 220, 284, 482  
*cāsere*: 495  
  
*caupland*: 32–33, 126, 128, 144, 146, 286, 352  
*cāw(e)l*: 409  
*ceallian*: 55, 126, 128, 136–37, 216–17,  
 243, 260, 261, 262, 278, 285, 402  
*cēap*: 32–33, 184  
*cēapian*: 33  
*cēapian frīdes*: 186  
*cēapland*: 32–33  
*cennan*: 432  
*ceorƿæx*: 199  
*ceorl*: 50, 197, 209–10, 213, 215, 218,  
 219, 220  
*ceorlborn*: 220  
*ceorlfolc*: 220  
*ceorlmann*: 51 n. 56, 209–10, 220  
*ceorlstrang*: 220  
*cēosan*: 108  
*cīegdan*: 256  
*clacu*: 496  
*clæclēas*: 496  
*cnearr*: 52, 76–79, 126, 128, 133, 134,  
 201–03, 243, 261, 285  
*Cnearresweorð* (*Kenaresford*): 78  
*cnif*: 107–08, 121, 126, 128, 136–37,  
 142–43, 153, 242, 252, 285, 494  
*cniht*: 210–11  
*gecnycled*: 224  
*cōp*: 32–34, 89, 126, 128, 152, 156, 482  
 ‘copade’ (*cōpian*?): 33  
*copp*: 421  
*cost*: 108–09, 126, 128, 134, 136–37,  
 139–40, 156, 181, 182, 229–30, 244,  
 253, 255, 257, 259 n. 12, 267, 269, 286  
*costian*: 108  
*craƿian*: 110–11, 126, 128, 136–37, 145,  
 147, 156, 163, 164–66, 286  
*craƿing*: 110 n. 134  
*Crochyrsta*: 109 n. 131  
*gecrōcod*: 109, 126, 128, 144, 146, 224, 242,  
 263, 263, 287  
*croft*: 226–67  
*crycc*: 109  
*cuman*  
*cuman ongēan*: 239  
*cuman tō wīdermāle*: 47–48, 126, 128,  
 145, 147, 156 n. 14, 164, 192, 438  
*cuman tōgēanes*: 239  
*cuman ūp*: 462  
*cumliðnes*: 238

- cuopel*: 202, 267  
*cuppe*: 421  
*cwēn*: 110, 220  
*cwene*: 110, 220  
*cwenfugol*: 3, 109–10, 126, 128, 144, 146, 218–20, 243, 278, 287, 378  
*cwenhirde*: 110, 220  
*cweðan*: 158  
     *cweðan gēa wið*: 399, 432  
     *cweðan ūtlah*: 271  
*cwic*: 419  
*cwicælmes*: 420  
*(ge)cwide*: 181, 428–29  
*c(w)ōmon*: 39  
*cwyddian*: 5, 110–11, 126, 128, 136–37, 156, 163, 165–66, 287  
*cynedōm*: 81  
*cynesmann*: 414  
*cynīng*  
     *full cynīng*: 439  
*cyre*: 229  
*cyrice*: 115, 276, 483  
*cyrīcfrīð*: 157, 265  
*cyrīcgrīð*: 115, 126, 128, 138–40, 139–40, 142–43, 157, 177–80, 265, 301  
*cyrīcrēn*: 54, 126, 128, 139–40, 156 n. 15, 160, 287  
*cyrtel*: 3, 432–33  
*cyst*: 108  
*(ge)cȳðan*: 190 n. 50, 428  
*gecȳðednes*: 428  
*cyðere*: 251  
*cȳðnes*: 429
- dædfruma*: 197  
*dæg*: 54, 56  
*dægesseage*: 99  
*dægmæl*: 231–32  
*dælan*  
     *dælan bilde*: 419  
     ‘*dæneðe*’: 433  
*darian*: 433–34  
*dēad*: 31  
     *\*deanian*: 433  
*dear* (*dar*, Nb.): 401  
*dearf*: 74, 90–92, 126, 128, 134, 144, 146, 227–28, 233, 243, 244, 253, 255, 257, 266, 269, 288, 491  
*dearflic*: 90, 126, 128, 134, 227–28, 253, 255, 257, 269, 288  
*dearflice*: 91, 126, 128, 144, 146, 227–28, 263–64, 288  
*dearfscipe*: 90, 126, 128, 134, 227–28, 253, 255, 257, 267, 269, 288  
*Denegyld*: 188  
*Denemearc*: 52 n. 58  
*denisc*: 205, 221–22  
*(ge)deorf*: 91, 92, 228, 244  
     *\*diegan*: 493  
*diht*: 158  
*Dingesmere*: 78, 83 n. 100  
*discðegn*: 211  
*dōm*: 158, 229, 440  
*dōn*: 493  
*dreng*: 55 n. 66, 92–93, 126, 128, 129, 136–37, 197–98, 243, 260–61, 288, 491  
*drīfan ūt*: 271  
*drinc*: 5  
*drincelēan*: 5, 111–12, 126, 128, 139–40, 156 n. 15, 160, 189, 190, 243, 288  
*dropian* (*drupian*): 434  
     *\*drūpian*: 434  
*drūpung*: 434  
*dryhten*: 45 n. 38  
*drȳigce*: 93 n. 111  
*dunnian*: 433  
*dynnan* (*dynian*): 433  
*(ge)dyrstig*: 227–28, 266  
*gedrystlic*: 227  
*dyttan*: 117
- ēac*: 118  
*eadorbryce*: 116  
*eahta* (WS; ‘hta’, Nb.): 44, 49  
*eald*: 464  
*ealdor*  
     *hiredes ealdor*: 216  
*ealdordōm*: 81  
*ealdorlegu*: 84  
*ealdormann*: 80, 136 (Table 8, first note), 210, 213–15, 258, 260 n. 14, 261, 267, 376  
*ēarfoðfere*: 436  
*earg* (*arg*, Nb.): 400–01  
*earnan* (*ærnan*): 63  
*earnung*: 187–88  
*earsgang*: 441



- ēasteward*: 3 n. 3  
*ēaðfēre*: 436  
*ecgan*: 55  
*efen*: 93, 434  
*efening*: 183  
*efne*: 93–94, 126, 128, 134, 228, 232–33, 267, 269, 289  
*efigeagung*: 188  
*egenu*: 495  
*(ge)eggian*: 55, 89, 126, 128, 134, 217, 253, 256–57, 266, 289, 439  
*egnwirht*: 188  
*ēl*: 231  
*elnboga (elboga)*: 411 n. 7  
*endebyrdnes*: 229  
*endesāta*: 42  
*eorcnanstān (eorcnastān, eorclastān)*: 435  
*eorl*: 80–81, 126, 128, 133, 134, 136–37, 138–40, 142–43, 144–47, 210, 213–15, 220, 242, 243, 246, 258, 260, 261, 262, 263, 270, 277, 289–96, 345, 349, 352, 353, 369, 376, 470 n. 1, 490  
*eorldōm*: 81, 126, 128, 139–40, 144–47, 215, 246, 277, 296–97, 490  
*eorlgyfu*: 81, 126, 128, 139–40, 215, 277, 297  
*eorlriht*: 81, 126, 128, 139–40, 215, 277, 297  
*eornost*: 120, 166  
*esne*: 208, 267–68  
*ēðelstæf*: 435–36  
  
*fæder*  
*fæder hīredes*: 216  
*fæder hīwisc*: 216  
*fær*: 78  
*fæst*: 95, 465  
*fæstan*: 95  
*fæsten*: 95  
*fæstnian*: 189–90  
*fæt*: 94, 105, 126, 128, 297  
*(ge)fāh*: 167, 172  
*faran*: 78  
*faran mid*: 496  
*farnian*: 94–95, 126, 128, 134, 228, 267, 269, 297  
*fēalōg*: 449  
*fearr* (WS; ‘farras’, Nb.): 94  
*fēdan*: 173  
*feld*: 501  
*fell*: 154–55  
  
*feng*: 92  
*feoh*: 5, 95, 184, 188, 489  
*feohsceatt*: 188  
*fēolaga*: 5, 87 n. 103, 95, 126, 128, 136–37, 138, 140, 145, 147, 156, 182–83, 243, 278, 297–98, 371  
*fēolagscipe*: 95, 126, 128, 138, 140, 144, 146, 182–83, 298  
*feorhlegu*: 84  
*feorm (færm)*: 185, 223, 267  
*feormian*: 173  
*fēorðing*: 421–22  
*fēorðling*: 422  
*gefēra*: 183  
*fēran*: 249  
*fēran mid*: 496  
*fēre*: 273, 436–37  
*fērend*: 238  
*fēsian (fysian)*: 38, 398  
*feste*: 71, 95–96, 126, 128, 136–37, 156, 169, 298, 497  
*fēster (foster)*: 70  
*fēstermann*: 70–71, 89, 96, 126, 128, 134, 136–37, 142–43, 156, 169–70, 298, 497  
*flēge*: 37–38, 89, 126, 128, 134, 201–02, 217, 253, 255, 267, 298  
*flēon*: 174  
*flies*: 154–55  
*flota*: 437  
*flotmann*: 205  
*flyma*: 162, 172–73, 179  
*flymanfeorm*: 173 n. 38  
*fōda*: 225  
*folc*: 438, 439  
*folclagu*: 85, 126, 128, 139–40, 156, 157–59, 308  
*folcstede*: 437–38, 468  
*(ge)fōn (fangen)*: 40, 240 n. 105, 438, 448  
*for (føre)*: 74  
*forbod*: 48  
*forcraflan* (‘forcrafað’): 111  
*fordēman*: 248–49  
*fordōn*: 248–49  
*forespræc*: 181  
*foreweard*: 181, 182, 438  
*foreword*: 181, 182, 438–39  
*forewyrð(e)*: 181, 182, 438  
*forgyldan*: 489

- forlætan* *ūt*: 498  
*forlættēow*: 216  
*forma* (*fīrmest*): 241, 422  
*formælan*: 482  
*formāl(a)* (*formæl*): 47–48, 126, 128, 136–37, 156, 181, 192, 317, 482  
*forridel*: 238  
*forwegen*: 439  
*forwost* (*forwest*): 213, 216, 267, 422  
*fra* (*fro*): 65–67, 89, 126, 127, 129, 138–40, 141, 142–43, 144–47, 149, 152, 298–99, 483  
*framwearðes*: 66  
*fraward*: 66, 126, 129, 144, 146, 152, 299  
*frēa*: 422  
*freca*: 446  
*frēo*: 168, 417  
*frēo and saclēas*: 168  
*frēolæta*: 209  
*frēolsmann*: 209  
*frēomann*: 209–10  
*frēondlēas*: 173 n. 37  
*frēondlice* ('frunlice'): 98  
*frēotmann*: 209  
*frīd*: 112–14, 126, 128, 139–40, 156 n. 15, 173, 177–80, 186–87, 203, 261, 265, 270, 273, 278, 299, 416  
*frīdāð*: 186, 187  
*frīðborb*: 48  
*frīðgeard*: 180 n. 41  
*(ge)frīðian*: 115, 179, 180, 186–87  
*frīðland*: 416  
*frīðlēas*: 112, 113–14, 115, 126, 128, 139–40, 156 n. 15, 162, 171, 172, 173, 179, 299  
*frīðmāl*: 47–48, 126, 128, 136–37, 156, 156 n. 15, 181, 191–92, 317  
*frīðsōcn*: 180 n. 41  
*frīðsplott*: 180 n. 41  
*frīðstōl*: 180, 186  
*frīðstōw*: 180 n. 41  
*frīðgeuwrit*: 181  
*from* (*fram*): 65–67  
*fruma*: 197  
*fulfæstnian*: 189  
*full*: 439  
*gefylce*: 439  
*fylcian*: 439–40  
*fyrð*: 162 n. 21  
*fyrðscip*: 204  
*fyrðung*: 196  
*fyrrest*: 74  
*fyrhð*: 501  
*fyrre(r)*: 74, 89, 126, 129, 144, 146, 241–42, 299  
*fȳsian* (*fēsian*): 38  
*gærsun(a)*: 55–56, 126, 128, 138–40, 142–43, 144–47, 156, 189, 190–91, 233, 235–36, 242, 243, 246, 248, 263, 271, 278, 299–300, 372, 483  
*gegada*: 183  
*gegæncga*: 441  
*gafol* ('gofol'): 190–91, 259  
*gafolræden*: 190  
*gān ūp*: 462  
*gang*: 418, 441  
*gangan* (*gengan*): 440  
*gārmitting*: 440  
*gārræc*: 419  
*gāst*: 425  
*gēa* ('iā'; *gē*, *Angl.*): 96, 399  
*gealla*: 409  
*geard*: 115  
*gearu*: 55  
*gearwe*: 94 n. 112, 236  
*geat* ('gate'): 400  
*geatan*: 96, 126, 128, 144, 146, 189–90, 233–34, 300, 374, 493  
*gegenga*: 441  
*gēmung*: 185, 267–68  
*gēmunglic*: 268  
*genge* ('privy'): 440  
*(ge)genge* ('troop'): 195 n. 56, 440–41  
*gēogod*: 463  
*geonga*: 221  
*gestning*: 67–69, 126, 129, 144, 146, 237–38, 243, 263, 264, 277, 300  
*giefan*: 234  
*giesthūs*: ('gesthus') 68, 410  
*glæd*: 496  
*glēaw*: 407  
*glīwstæf*: 441–42  
*gold*: 409  
*goldfæted*: 154  
*goldfæg*: 154  
*goldwrecen*: 96–97, 126, 128, 138, 140, 154, 301  
*grā*: 39, 126, 128

- græf*: 426  
*græft*: 426  
*græg*: 39  
*grafan*: 426  
*grāscinnen*: 39, 58, 126, 128, 144, 146,  
 154–56, 242–43, 248, 277, 278, 324  
*gremian*: 442  
*‘greðe’*: 405–06  
*grīghund* (cWS *grīeghund*): 437, 442  
*grimlic*: 225  
*grimm*: 225  
*grīð*: 5, 59, 112 n. 140, 114–15, 126,  
 128, 134, 136–37, 138–40, 142–43,  
 144–47, 156, 157, 177–80, 181, 182,  
 186–87, 192, 203, 242, 243, 246, 248,  
 260, 261, 263, 265, 270, 278, 301–03,  
 406, 494  
*grīðbryce*: 115, 126, 128, 138–40, 142–43,  
 144–47, 171, 175, 177–80, 182, 210,  
 345, 349, 353, 494  
*grīðian*: 115, 126, 128, 138–40, 142–43,  
 144–47, 177–80, 182, 186–87, 246,  
 303–04, 376  
*grīðlagu*: 5, 85, 115, 126, 128, 139–40,  
 156, 157–59, 177–80, 308  
*grīðlēas*: 115, 126, 128, 139–40, 177–80, 304  
*grundlēas*: 460  
*gullisc*: 408–09  
*‘Gunwara’*: 276–77  
*gūð*: 443  
*gūðfugol*: 443  
*gūðhafoc*: 442–43  
*gūðgemōt*: 440  
*gūðgedingu*: 440  
*gylð*: 188–89  
*gylðan*: 460  
*gylt*: 230  
*gyltend*: 167  
*gyltig*: 167  
*gyrd*: 104  
*gyst*: 68  
*gystærn*: 237  
*gysthūs*: 237  
*gystian*: 237, 238  
*gystliðnes*: 237  
*gýt* (WS; ‘get’, Kt.): 68  
  
*hā*: 40–42, 44, 126, 128, 139–40, 206–07, 304  
*habban* (‘heofdon’): 173, 427, 444  
  
*hād*: 115  
*hādgrīð*: 115, 126, 128, 139–40, 177–80, 304  
*hæf*: 444  
*hæfen(e)*: 273, 443–45  
*hæil*: 29, 119, 126, 128, 148, 152, 217, 305  
*hæleð*: 36  
*hælnes*: 115, 304  
*hælnesgrīð*: 115, 126, 128, 139–40, 177–80  
*hæman*: 185  
*hæmed*: 185, 267  
*hær*: 39 n. 27  
*hærn*: 105  
*hæst*: 225  
*hæðen*: 406  
*hāl* (wes *hāl*): 29  
*hamele*: 41, 116, 126, 128, 139–40, 206–07,  
 270, 305  
*æt hamelan*: 116, 206  
*hāmsōcn*: 116–17, 126, 128, 134, 138–40,  
 139–40, 142–43, 144–47, 156, 160–61,  
 171, 175, 243, 305, 345, 353, 494  
*hana*: 40  
*hand*: 115  
*handæx*: 199  
*handfæstan*: 497  
*handfæstnung*: 497  
*handgrīð*: 115, 126, 128, 139–40,  
 177–80, 304  
*handplega*: 445–46  
*hangian*: 488  
*hānum*: 40, 89, 126, 127, 129, 136–37,  
 152, 276, 306  
*hārfagera*: 39 n. 27  
*hāsæta*: 42, 126, 128, 145, 147, 192,  
 195–96, 304  
*hāt*: 158  
*hē* (*him*): 40 n. 29, 276  
*hēafdesmann*: 411–12, 414  
*hēafod* (*hafod*): 35  
*hēafodling*: 34  
*hēafodmann*: 411  
*hēafodweard*: 267  
*bealdan*: 117, 126, 128, 144, 145  
 (Table 14, second note), 146, 173,  
 196, 207, 246, 248, 249, 306  
*healf*: 417  
*healffrēo*: 87, 416–17  
*healfmarc*: 52, 53, 89, 126, 128, 133, 136–37,  
 138–40, 142–43, 144–47, 199–201, 319

- healsbeorg*: 145 (Table 14, third note)  
*healsbrynige*: 62, 126, 128, 144, 147,  
 198 n. 64, 284  
*heard*: 225  
*hearma*: 155  
*hearmascinnen*: 58, 126, 128, 144, 146,  
 154–56, 242–43, 248, 277, 278, 325  
*hearoswealwe*: 443  
*heden*: 406  
*hegian*: 491  
*hemman*: 116  
*heona*: 267  
*heorða*: 155  
*heoruwulf*: 446  
*here*: 117 n. 148, 161–62, 194, 446  
*herebeorg*: 237, 446, 498  
*herebeorgian*: 237 n. 102, 446, 498  
*heregylð*: 188  
*heretoga*: 410  
*hī(e)* (*heora*, *hira*): 398, 426  
*hildecalla*: 402  
*bildewulf*: 446  
*'hird'*: 446  
*hīred*: 446  
*hīredmann*: 211, 446  
*hlāford*: 208 n. 78  
     *hīredes hlāford*: 216  
     *scip(es) hlāford*: 413  
*hlēapan* (*hlūpan*, *hlēopan*): 27, 31, 97–98  
     *hlēapan út*: 97–98, 126, 128, 144, 146,  
     171, 174–75, 246, 306  
*hlýðan*: 216  
*hlybban* (WS; *hlæban*, Angl.): 69  
*gehlyt(t)a*: 183  
*hlōt*: 98  
*hofding*: 22, 34–35, 59, 126, 128, 144, 145  
     (Table 14, first note), 146, 216, 247,  
     248, 249, 306  
*hold* (social rank): 22, 35–36, 76, 89, 126,  
 128, 133, 134, 210–11, 212–13, 243,  
 253, 255, 267–69, 277, 306, 369, 394  
*hold* ('gracious'): 36  
*holm*: 81–82, 126, 128, 138–40, 219, 231,  
 277, 307  
*hōn*: 488  
*hōre*: 447  
*hōrecwene*: 447  
*hōring*: 447  
*hornscip*: 204  
*horshwæl*: 3 n. 3  
*brān*: 3 n. 2, 30–31, 95  
*brīm*: 447  
*brīmceald*: 447  
*brīmforst*: 447  
*(ge)brīnan*: 75 n. 90  
*bringedstefna*: 204  
*bringnaca*: 204  
*brīð*: 447  
*'hrydg'*: 447  
*hund*: 110, 220  
*hundred*: 98, 126, 128, 136–37, 138, 140,  
 177, 201 n. 68, 307, 406  
     *'hundrað'*: 406, 468  
*hūs*  
     *cumena hūs*: 237  
*hūsbönda*: 107, 126, 128, 136–37, 138, 140,  
 142–43, 215–16, 242, 243, 277, 283  
*\*hūsbönde*: 107 n. 129  
*hūsbyrce*: 116, 160–61, 175  
*hūscarl*: 51, 126, 128, 138–40, 142–43,  
 144–47, 193, 210–12, 214, 270,  
 277, 285  
*hūsting*: 82–84, 126, 128, 138–40, 175–77,  
 242, 270, 307, 363  
*hwæðere*: 486  
*hýd*: 154–55  
*hýr*: 188  
*hýran* (WS; *hēran*, Kt.): 68  
*hyrd*: 154–55  
*hyse*: 221  
*hyserinc*: 221  
*hyttan*: 117, 126, 129, 144, 145 (Table 14,  
 first note), 146, 228, 233, 239, 244,  
 247, 251, 263, 264, 307  
*īedan* (WS): 37  
*īgeð* (*ēgeð*): 231  
*in*: 65  
*inborh*: 171  
*infastenedeof*: 448, 498  
*inlagian*: 86, 126, 128, 139–40, 144–47,  
 156, 157–59, 171, 172, 174, 249 n. 3,  
 308  
*innan*: 494  
*inseten*: 158  
*insetnis*: 158  
*insiht*: 43

- lāc*: 185  
*lād*: 164  
*lædan*: 207  
*‘lædunge’*: 449  
*(ge)læg*: 84, 429  
*læn*: 489  
*læst*: 118, 126, 128, 142–43, 230, 307, 378  
*lætan*  
     *lætan inn*: 498  
     *lætan út*: 498  
*læð*: 448  
     *ne læð ne land*: 448  
*laga*: 429  
*lagian*: 85, 126, 128, 139–40, 144–47, 156, 157–59, 248, 308, 448  
*lagu* (‘law’): 4, 5, 32, 84–86, 95, 115, 126, 128, 134, 136–37, 138–40, 142–43, 144–47, 148, 156, 157–59, 161, 171, 173, 174, 192, 206, 208, 242, 243, 248, 251, 252, 263, 277, 308–11, 330, 331, 348, 353, 368, 373, 377, 379, 384, 387, 393, 394, 429, 448, 467 n. 49, 470 n. 2, 479, 490  
*lagu* (‘water’): 449  
*lahbreca*: 85, 126, 128, 156, 157–59, 311  
*lahbrecende*: 85, 126, 128, 142–43, 156, 157–59, 312  
*lahbryce*: 85, 126, 128, 139–40, 156, 157–59, 312  
*lahcēap*: 32–33, 85, 126, 128, 156, 157–59, 312  
*lahcōp*: 32–34, 85, 126, 128, 136–37, 152, 156, 157–59, 286, 312, 427  
*lahlic*: 85, 126, 128, 139–40, 142–43, 144, 147, 156, 157, 157–59, 312, 395  
*lahlice*: 86, 126, 128, 139–40, 156, 157–59, 312  
*lahmann*: 86, 126, 128, 142–43, 156, 157–59, 312, 382  
*lahriht*: 85, 126, 128, 139–40, 156, 157–59, 312  
*lahslite*: 86, 126, 128, 138–40, 139–40, 142–43, 156, 157–59, 312  
*lahwita*: 85, 126, 128, 139–40, 156, 157–59, 313  
*lahgewrit*: 85, 126, 128, 139–40, 156, 313  
*land*: 32, 99, 100 n. 123, 104, 448  
     *land and lōge*: 449  
*landcēap*: 32–33  
*landcōp*: 32–34, 126, 128, 136–37, 152, 156, 286  
*landefen*: 93  
*landesmann*: 205, 412, 414  
*landfyrd*: 194  
*landhæbbende*: 267  
*landlagu*: 86, 126, 128, 138, 140, 156, 157–59, 313  
*landlēod*: 412  
*landriht*: 86  
*landsēta*: 42  
*lātteow*: 267  
*lēag*: 451  
*leahtor*: 118, 230  
*lēan*: 5, 112, 188  
*\*leaw*: 451  
*lecgan*: 54, 84  
     *lecgan laga*: 448–49  
*leger*: 84, 226  
*lendān*: 449  
*lending*: 449  
*lēodan*: 133 (Table 5, note)  
*libban*: 489  
*licgan*: 84, 249  
     *licgan ægylde*: 460  
     *licgan orgylde*: 460  
     *licgan ungyldde*: 460  
     *licgan wederfæst*: 465  
*lid*: 60, 61, 79, 203  
*lida*: 60, 61  
*liesan*: 87  
*lið*: 60–61, 126, 128, 144–47, 192–95, 246, 248, 249 n. 3, 277, 316  
*liðan*: 60  
*liðsmann*: 60–61, 126, 128, 138, 140, 142–43, 145, 147, 189, 192–97, 201, 277, 316–17  
*loft*: 72–73, 126, 128, 136–37, 152, 231, 252, 317  
     *on lofte*: 72–73, 252  
*lōge*: 449  
*lōgian*: 145 (Table 14, fourth note)  
*lōb*: 449  
*lundlaga*: 95  
*lyft*: 72, 231, 252  
     *on lyfte*: 73, 252  
*lȳsan*: 38  
*lȳsing*: 38, 67 n. 84, 87, 126, 128, 133, 144, 146, 209, 212, 243, 277, 278, 317, 416

- mac(c)alic*: 423  
*gemæc*: 423  
*gemæcca (gemacca)*: 423  
*gemæclīc*: 423  
*mæg*: 455  
*mægglagu*: 85, 126, 128, 139–40, 156, 157–59, 313  
*mæl* (WS): 46, 47, 449–50  
*mælan* (WS): 46  
*mældæg*: 48  
*mæðel* (nWS): 46, 175 n. 40  
*mæðlan* (nWS): 46  
*magan*: 450  
*māl*: 46–48, 126, 128, 144–47, 163–64, 181–82, 188–89, 191–92, 318  
*māldæg*: 47–48, 89, 126, 128, 138, 140, 181 n. 43, 184, 318  
*mancus*: 201, 484  
*gemang*: 175  
*mann*: 71, 98, 219, 417  
*landes mann*: 412  
*manslot (manna blot)*: 71, 98–100, 126, 128, 134, 144, 146, 152 n. 10, 318, 411 n. 8  
*māra*: 450  
*marc*: 52–53, 77, 89, 126, 128, 138–40, 142–43, 144–47, 199–201, 243, 270, 277, 319–20, 363, 374, 484  
*martyr*: 251  
*māðm*: 235, 271, 278  
*meaht* ('miht', WS; 'maht', nWS): 49  
*mearc*: 52 n. 58  
*mearca*: 103  
*mearcian*: 103  
*mēd*: 408  
*mēdsceatt*: 188  
*meord*: 408  
*gemet*: 229  
*(ge)mētan*: 239, 440  
*micel*: 450  
*midl*: 207  
*mīnre* ('mire'): 411  
*miscrōced*: 224  
*mislic (missenlic)*: 450  
*mismicel*: 450  
*mitting*: 440  
*gemōd*: 191  
*gemōdsum*: 191  
*mōr-*: 34  
*morgen (merne)*: 267  
*(ge)mōt*: 83, 175–77  
*gumena gemōt*: 440  
*mund* ('money paid by bridegroom'): 87–88, 126, 128, 138, 140, 184, 320  
*mund and maldæg*: 47, 88, 126, 128, 156, 182, 184, 192  
*mund* ('protection'): 113, 177–78, 180  
*mundbryce*: 175 n. 39, 349  
*mūð*: 45  
*mycel*: 225  
*myne*: 499  
*nā*: 96  
*nægelsex*: 494  
*nægledbord*: 79, 203  
*nægledcnearr*: 78–79, 126, 128, 133, 201–03, 243, 285  
*nægledsinc*: 79  
*næm*: 39 n. 28, 170 n. 31  
*(ge)næman*: 39 n. 28  
*næming*: 181  
*nām*: 39, 126, 128, 139–40, 156 n. 15, 169, 170–71, 320  
*nama*: 399  
*nāmræde*: 399–400  
*nēadgafol*: 460  
*nēah* (WS; 'neh', Nb.): 49  
*(ge)niman*: 171, 234, 247, 264 n. 15  
*niman feste*: 169  
*niman frið*: 187, 376  
*niman herebeorge*: 237  
*niman seht*: 271  
*nīð*: 118  
*nīðing*: 59 n. 72, 118, 126, 128, 136–37, 145, 147, 160, 161–63, 172 n. 36, 320  
*nōmon*: 39  
*norren*: 88, 126, 128, 144, 146, 217–18, 221–22, 243, 246, 320  
*norðerne*: 88  
*norðeward*: 3 n. 3  
*norðmann*: 221–22  
*nū*: 267  
*nȳdgylð*: 451, 459–60  
*nȳdmæg*: 451  
*ōc*: 31 n. 13, 119–20, 126, 127, 129, 148, 152, 320, 423, 499  
*offēran*: 75  
*offylgan*: 75

- ofirnan*: 75  
*oftacan*: 75, 126, 129, 144, 146, 233,  
 235 n. 99, 237, 240, 263, 264, 326  
*Ohter*: 45 n. 39  
*on*: 453  
*onbrinan*: 75 n. 90  
*onnied*: 451  
*onsacan*: 165  
 'ontæcþ': 75 n. 90  
*open*: 54  
*ōra*: 2 n. 2, 34, 53, 89, 98 n. 117, 126, 128,  
 134, 136–37, 138–40, 144–47, 199–201,  
 243, 253, 255–56, 267, 277, 321  
*orlæg*: 84  
*ornest*: 120, 166–67  
*orrest*: 120, 126, 128, 144, 146, 156 n. 15,  
 163, 166–67, 321  
*orsorg*: 267  
*oðer*: 241  
*ōðerhwile*: 267  
*oðsacan*: 165  
*oxa*: 418  
*oxangang*: 411 n. 8, 418  
*oxanhyrde*: 99  
  
*pæning* (*pen(d)ing*): 421–22  
*pil*: 232  
*plega*: 445–46  
*plōgesland*: 99–100, 126, 128, 138, 140, 322,  
 411 n. 8, 418, 451  
*plōb*: 99, 451–52  
*prēostlagu*: 86, 126, 128, 142–43, 156,  
 157–59, 313  
*pund*: 200  
*pyl(e)wer(e)*: 452–53, 499  
*pylu*: 452  
  
*gerād*: 182  
*ræcing* ('racing'): 73  
*(ge)rædan*: 39, 114, 158, 405, 412, 448, 453  
*rædan on*: 453  
*geræde*: 236  
 'rædemen': 412 n. 10  
*(ge)ræden*: 182, 400  
*rædesmann*: 412, 414  
*rædic*: 64  
*(ge)rædnes*: 158, 182  
*ræpling*: 162–63  
*raggig*: 407–08  
  
*rān*: 53–54, 126, 128, 160, 243  
*gerēfa* ('groef-'): 422–23, 498  
*regol*: 158  
*regollagu*: 85, 126, 128, 139–40, 156,  
 157–59, 313  
*rennan*: 63, 89, 126, 128, 144, 146, 152,  
 218, 322  
*rēofan*: 453  
*(ge)reord*: 185, 267  
*reðra*: 195  
*ridesoht*: 409  
*(ge)riht*: 158–59, 466  
*rihtlagu*: 85, 126, 128, 139–40, 156,  
 157–59, 313  
*rihtlic*: 85  
*rihtlice*: 86  
*rihtung*: 158  
*rinnan*: 63  
*rōda*: 59  
*rōt*: 64–65, 126, 128, 144, 146, 148, 222–23,  
 242, 263–64, 277, 322, 466, 485  
*rōtfæst*: 65, 126, 128, 144, 146, 218, 223, 322  
*Rūm*–: 34  
*ryne* ('rina'): 453  
 'ryðrenan': 53 n. 63, 88 n. 105, 402  
  
*sac*: 100–01, 126, 128, 136–37, 156, 163,  
 167–69, 322  
*sacan*: 43, 116 n. 147, 165  
*sacful*: 101, 168  
*saclēas*: 57 n. 69, 58, 101, 126, 128, 134,  
 136–37, 138–40, 144–47, 156, 163,  
 167–68, 169, 253, 255, 266, 267, 268,  
 322–23, 491  
*sacu*: 100, 101, 116 n. 147, 163, 168  
*sadolbeorht*: 236  
*sadolboga*: 236  
*sadolfæt*: 94, 126, 128, 138–40, 233, 236, 297  
*sadolfell*: 236  
*sadolgearwe*: 94, 236, 402  
*sadolhaca*: 236  
*sæ* ('seo'): 427  
*sæcc*: 100, 453  
*sæccing*: 453  
*sæswealwe*: 443 n. 34  
*sæte*: 500–01  
*Sæternesday* ('sæteresdæg'): 411  
*sabt* (n. and a.): 40, 42–45, 126, 128, 144,  
 146, 152, 156 n. 14, 323, 375, 485



- sahtlian*: 45, 126, 128, 144, 146, 152,  
 156 n. 14, 323, 375, 485  
*sahtnes*: 126, 128, 144, 146, 152, 156 n. 14,  
 323, 375  
*\*salu* ('sala'): 454  
*samheort*: 48  
*sammæle*: 47, 48, 126, 128, 136–37, 138,  
 140, 156, 164, 191–92, 271, 318  
*(ge)samnung*: 175  
*samwist*: 48  
*samurædnes*: 48  
*sand*: 71, 238  
*sandermann*: 71, 89, 126, 129, 144, 146,  
 151, 238, 242, 324  
*sārstæf*: 441  
*sāwol*: 276  
*scēadan*: 58, 62  
*sceard*: 454–55  
*scearp*: 424  
*sceatt*: 184, 190–91, 235 n. 100, 248  
*scēað*: 62  
*sceaddig*: 167  
*scegd*: 29–30, 41, 62, 121, 126, 128, 138–40,  
 201–02, 203–04, 205, 206, 252, 270,  
 324  
*scegðmann*: 30, 80, 126, 128, 136–37,  
 205–06, 252, 324  
*(ge)scēot*: 403  
*sc(e)ot*: 403, 404  
*(ge)scēotan*: 403  
*sceppe*: 57, 58, 89, 126, 128, 144, 146, 324  
*scēr*: 57–58, 89, 126, 128, 145, 147,  
 156 n. 15, 163, 168–69, 324, 485  
*scēr and saclēas*: 168–69  
*scierpan*: 424  
*sciftan*: 455  
*scilling*: 200, 421  
*scinn*: 58, 126, 128, 144–47, 154–56,  
 242–43, 248, 277, 278, 325, 454  
*scip*: 56, 202, 204 n. 72, 267, 456  
*scipe*: 188  
*scipere*: 403  
*scipfyrd*: 195  
*scipfyrdung*: 196  
*(ge)scipian*: 455  
*sciplið*: 60–61, 126, 128, 145, 147, 192,  
 194–95, 277, 317  
*scipliðend*: 61  
*scipliðende*: 61  
*scirpende*: 424  
*scrimman*: 424  
*scripredra*: 195  
*scoru*: 58, 89, 126, 128, 144, 146, 325  
*scot*: 403–04  
*scotfrēo*: 403–04  
*scrēpan* ('screpes'): 424  
*scylīan* (*scilian*): 404–05  
*scylīan of māle*: 47, 126, 128, 145, 147,  
 188, 193, 404  
*sē* (*ðā*, *ðæra*, *ðāra*, *ðām*, *ðæm*): 90, 398, 410,  
 426–27  
*sēam*: 236  
*seax*: 153  
*(ge)sēcan*: 43, 116  
*secgan*: 168  
*(ge)seglan*: 3 n. 3  
*seht* (n.): 42–43, 181, 191, 271  
*seht* (a.): 42–43  
*sehtan*: 42  
*sellan* (*syllan*): 454  
*syllan ... on hyra sylfra dōm*: 419  
*se(o)r[d/ð]an* ('serð'): 59 n. 72, 101–02, 126,  
 129, 134, 240–41, 243, 253, 255, 257,  
 267, 325  
*set*: 425, 500  
*setl*: 425  
*setlan*: 45  
*setlgang*: 425  
*(ge)setnes*: 158  
*settan*: 448  
*settan frið*: 456  
*settan grið*: 456  
*settan of*: 456  
*settan of māle*: 47 n. 44, 188, 193, 456  
*settan sibb*: 456  
*settan tō*: 456  
*settan üt*: 188  
*sidung*: 158  
*sigel*: 102  
*(ge)siglan*: 3 n. 3  
*sittan*: 500  
*slāpan*: 465  
*slāpor*: 465  
*slātan*: 456  
*slāting*: 456  
*slēan* (WS; *slā(n)*, Nb.): 49, 53, 401  
*snā* (*snāw*): 31  
*snæcc* (*snacc*): 456–57

- sneare* (*snearb*): 457  
*snell*: 419  
*sōcn*: 116  
*gesōht*: 45  
*sōl*: 102–03, 126, 128, 230  
*sōlmerca*: 102–03, 126, 128, 142–43, 231–32, 325  
*song*: 103, 126, 128, 134, 225, 226, 253, 256, 257, 267, 268, 325  
*sorglēas*: 267  
*sorgstafas*: 441  
*sōðfæst*: 65  
*sōðlice*: 267  
*sōðword*: 158  
*(ge)sparrian*: 94 n. 113, 402  
*spellboda*: 238  
*sp(r)æc*: 163  
*sp(r)ecan*  
*sp(r)ecan æfter*: 165  
*sp(r)ecan on*: 165  
*sp(r)ecan ymb*: 165  
*stæf*: 441–42  
*stæðswealwe*: 443 n. 34  
*stalu*: 54, 160  
*stān*: 28, 435  
*stānæx*: 199  
*stælbṛān*: 3 n. 3, 30  
*stefn* ('voice'): 457–58  
*stefn* ('fixed time'): 457–58  
*stefnan*: 458  
*(ge)stefnian*: 164–65, 457–58  
*steng*: 92  
*stēor(e)*: 158  
*stēoresmann*: 413–14  
*stēormann*: 413  
*stēorrēdra*: 413 n. 12  
*sticca*: 103–04, 126, 128, 136–37, 325  
*stieran* (*stēoran*): 207, 413  
*stop*: 207  
*stōr*: 120–21, 126, 128, 144, 146, 224–25, 325  
*strang*: 225  
*streng*: 92  
*strēowen*: 226 n. 94  
*strewian*: 226 n. 94  
*strīð*: 458  
*stūpian*: 434  
*sulh*: 452  
*sullung*: 452  
*sumerlida*: 133 (Table 5, note)
- sumor*: 61  
*sumorlida*: 61, 76, 126, 128, 133, 192, 277, 317  
*sunne*: 102  
*sunset*: 424–45  
*sunu*: 454  
*sūðeweard*: 3 n. 3  
*swān*: 30  
*swearð*: 154–55  
*swegen*: 30, 126, 128, 144, 146, 218, 220–21, 326  
*swegl*: 102  
*swegle*: 102  
*swīðlic*: 225  
*symbol*: 185, 267  
*(ge)syngian*: 240  
*synn*: 230  
*synnian*: 267  
*synnig*: 167, 267
- tā*: 41  
*tacan* (*tōc*, *tōcon*): 74–75, 89, 121, 126, 128, 144, 145 (Table 14, first note), 146, 230, 233, 234, 235 n. 99, 242, 247, 248, 251, 263, 264 n. 15, 326, 489  
*tacan on*: 75, 126, 128, 144, 146, 224, 233, 235 n. 99, 240, 263–64, 326  
*tacan wið*: 75, 126, 128, 144, 146, 233, 234–35, 326  
*talū*: 163  
*taperæx*: 121, 126, 128, 130, 142–43, 198–99, 243, 277, 326, 357, 420, 444–45  
*tapor* (*taper*): 199  
*targa*: 402  
*tēodung* (*tīðing*): 422  
*tēon*: 264 n. 15  
*tīd*: 406  
*tīdan*: 407  
*tīdung*: 406–07  
*tīhtan*: 45  
*tīhtlian*: 45  
*til* (Nb.): 253, 419, 492  
*tō*: 276, 492  
*toft*: 45, 89, 126, 128, 135, 136–37, 138–40, 225, 226–27, 243, 326–27, 448  
*toll*: 190–91  
*torngemōt*: 440

- tōscifian*: 455  
*tōscylan*: 404  
*trēo* ('tre-'): 425  
*'getryccað'*: 408  
*trymman* (*trymian*): 190 n. 50  
*tunece*: 432  
*tūnesmann*: 414  
*'turfgret'*: 426  
*turfhaga*: 426  
*turfhlēow*: 426  
*twā*: 267  
*twēgen*: 38  
*twiga* (*twiwa*): 106  
*(ge)twinn*: 106, 458–59  
*tynder*: 225
- ḡā*: 501  
*ḡæge*: 397–98  
*ḡæt*: 415, 487  
*ḡānian*: 433  
*ḡe*: 501  
*ḡeahwæðere*: 486  
*ḡearfian*: 49  
*ḡegengylde*: 27–28 n. 5, 459–60  
*ḡegn*: 27–28 n. 5, 208, 210–12, 267–68, 410  
*ḡegnestra*: 410  
*ḡegnlagu*: 85, 126, 128, 138–40, 156, 157–59, 313  
*ḡeodsceaða*: 162–63  
*ḡeof*: 448  
*ḡeofgild*: 460  
*ḡeofian*: 160  
*ḡe(o)nest*: 410  
*'ḡeora'*: 426–27  
*ḡeow*: 208, 210, 267–68  
*ḡeowa*: 208  
*ḡeowdōm*: 81  
*ḡēs* (*ḡisses*, *ḡissum*): 426  
*ḡignen*: 208, 257  
*ḡing*: 83, 175 n. 40  
*ḡyrwurde ḡing*: 235  
*(ge)ḡinge*: 181, 182  
*ḡir*: 69, 89, 126, 128, 134, 207–08, 217, 253, 255, 256, 327  
*ḡ[i/ēo]we*: 256  
*ḡonne* ('pon'): 419, 450  
*ḡor*: 411  
*ḡorp*: 63–64, 89, 126, 128, 144, 146, 152, 327
- ḡræl(l)*: 69–70, 126, 128, 134, 136–37, 139–40, 142–43, 207–08, 210, 243, 253, 255, 267–68, 277, 327–28  
*ḡrælrīht*: 70, 126, 128, 139–40, 207, 328  
*ḡrefe*: 104–05, 126, 128, 134, 328  
*ḡrinen*: 105  
*ḡrinlic*: 105  
*ḡrinna*: 105–06, 126, 128, 136–37, 328, 459  
*\*ḡridding* (*\*ḡriding*): 2 n. 2, 421  
*ḡriwa*: 105  
*ḡrop*: 63, 64 n. 81, 152 n. 8  
*ḡrymfæst*: 65  
*ḡunor*: 45, 411  
*ḡunor*: 225  
*ḡunring*: 224  
*ḡunresdæg* ('bur(r)esdæg'): 410–11  
*'ḡuucncgu'* ('ḡwænga'): 414–15  
*ḡwang*: 414–15  
*ḡweorh*: 466  
*ḡyfd*: 54, 160  
*open ḡyfd*: 54
- Ulf*: 277  
*unbesacen*: 165  
*unbōht*: 266  
*uncēaped*: 266  
*uncodū*: 461  
*uncræft*: 461  
*uncrafian* (*un(be)crafod*): 110–11, 126, 128, 136–37, 144, 146, 156, 163, 164, 165–66, 287  
*uncwyddian* (*uncwydd*): 110–11, 126, 128, 136–37, 144, 146, 156, 163, 165–66, 287  
*undæd*: 461  
*underfōn*: 264 n. 15  
*underfōn gestning*: 237  
*underwedd*: 171  
*unfer*: 437  
*unforworht*: 167, 168  
*unfrið*: 3, 178, 186, 187, 416  
*unfriðflota*: 187  
*unfriðhere*: 187  
*unfriðland*: 416  
*ungerȳde*: 225  
*ungerȳdelic*: 225  
*ungrīð*: 115, 126, 128, 144, 147, 177–80, 304  
*ungrund*: 460  
*ungrynde*: 460  
*ungylde*: 460

- unlæd*: 448  
*unlagagield*: 86, 126, 128, 144, 146, 156, 157–59, 313  
*unlagu*: 86, 126, 128, 138–40, 139–40, 144–47, 156, 157–59, 168, 210, 313–14, 362, 449  
*unne*: 499  
*unniðing*: 118, 126, 128, 144, 146, 162, 320, 495  
*unræd*: 461  
*unriht*: 86, 448  
*unsac*: 101, 126, 128, 136–37, 139–40, 156, 163, 165, 167–68, 243, 322, 448  
*unsabt*: 126, 128, 144, 146, 152, 156 n. 14, 323, 375  
*unseht*: 191  
*unsehtnes*: 42  
*unsynnig*: 266  
*unwine*: 461, 501  
*unwiderweardlic*: 191  
*unwlitig*: 224  
*ūp*: 462  
*ūpgang*: 461–62  
*ūthlēap*: 97  
*ūthlēapan*: 97; *see also under hlēapan*, *hlēapan ūt*  
*ūtlaga (ūtlah)*: 86–87, 95, 96, 126, 128, 134, 136–37, 138–40, 142–43, 144–47, 156, 162, 171–74, 242, 252, 262, 263, 271, 314–15, 374, 429, 438  
*ūtlagian*: 86, 126, 128, 136–37, 138–40, 144–47, 156, 171, 174, 246, 252, 271, 315, 490  
*ūtlagu*: 86, 126, 128, 136–37, 144, 147, 156, 171, 174, 315–16  
  
*(ge)wæd* 62, 247  
*Wægen*: 224  
*wæl*: 48  
*wælcyrige*: 464, 468  
*wæpentac*: 75–76, 89, 126, 128, 134, 136–37, 142–43, 144, 146, 156, 177, 326  
*wæpengedræc*: 76  
*wæpengeurixl*: 76, 440, 445  
*wæpnedbarn*: 220 n. 89  
*wæpnedcild*: 220 n. 89  
*wæpnedmann*: 220 n. 89  
*wær*: 181  
  
*wæs*: 46  
*wæterfæt*: 105  
*wæð*: 62, 89, 126, 128, 144, 145 (Table 14, first note), 146, 152, 230, 247, 328  
*walrēaf*: 48, 126, 128, 136–37, 152, 156, 328  
*wanian*: 464  
*wangere*: 453  
*waru*: 227, 453  
*weald*: 501  
*wearg*: 162  
*weccan*: 217, 256, 266  
*wedbrōðor*: 133, 183, 371, 464  
*wedd*: 171  
*wederfæst*: 465  
*weg*: 29, 38, 229  
*wela*: 235  
*weorc*: 179  
*weorðan*  
*weorðan sammæle*: 271  
*wer* ('case'): 452–53  
*wer* ('man'): 215  
*werian*: 452  
*werod*: 175  
*wesan (wosan, Nb.)*: 422  
*wician*: 237  
*wicing*: 205, 418  
*wicung*  
*cumena wicung*: 237  
*wielen*: 208  
*wif*: 110, 215, 216, 220  
*wiffæst*: 465  
*wifmann*: 219  
*wine*: 461  
*wiscan*: 405  
*wisc(h)ere*: 405  
*wise*: 229, 257  
*wist*: 422  
*(ge)wita*: 183, 428  
*witan*: 465  
*witefæst*: 465  
*gewitnes*: 248  
*witodlic*: 465  
*witodlice*: 465, 502  
*wit(t)er*: 465, 502  
*wit(t)erlice*: 465  
*wittig*: 465  
*witword*: 427–28  
*wið*: 432  
*widercwide*: 48

*widermål*: 47–48, 126, 128,  
145, 147, 163, 164, 318

*widertalu*: 164

*widertihle*: 164

*wlite*: 64, 484

*wlitig*: 484

*wlitigian*: 484

*wob*: 466

*wöbbogen*: 224

*word*: 171, 428, 439

*woruldlagu*: 85, 126, 128,  
139–40, 316

*woruldspêd*: 235

*wrang* ('injustice'): 273,  
466–67

*wrang* ('rough'): 466

*wrang(a)* ('hold of a ship'):  
467–68

*wrangwis*: 466

*wringan*: 466

*(ge)wrixl*: 440

*wælgāra wrixl*: 440, 445,  
465

*wudu*: 501

*wulf*: 110, 220, 277, 446

*gewuna*: 229

*wundenstefna*: 204

*wurdon*: 59

*wylf*: 110, 220

*(ge)wyrde*: 439

*wyrt*: 64, 222–23

*wyrtruma*: 222–23, 485

*wyrtwala*: 222–23

*wȳsc*: 229

*yfel*: 466

*yld*: 462–64

*yldast*: 216, 247, 249,  
463 n. 44

*ymbcyme*: 175

*ymb(e)*: 487

*ȳre (ēre)*: 38, 89, 126, 128,  
136–37, 144–47,  
199–201, 321

*ȳrfan*: 89, 223 n. 93

*ȳrfe* (WS; *erfe*, nWS): 89,  
184

*ȳrnan*: 63

*ȳðlida* ('ȳðlið'): 61 n. 76, 407

## Middle English

'agene': 495

*at*: 487–88

*(a)yēven ūp*: 493

*bēn* ('waren'): 499

*ibōn* ('ready'; *ibōned*): 430–31

*bōn* ('prayer'): 488

*bond*: 218

*bōnde*: 107

*bōndelōnd*: 209

*bōthe*: 471, 490

*brennen*: 482

*bridāle*: 185

*brinie*: 198 n. 64, 481

*brod*: 408

*brord*: 408

*būtecarl*: 196

*caiser*: 495

*carl*: 218, 210

*carlman*: 219, 482

*cherl*: 218

*choppen*: 33

*claklēs*: 496

*clemben*: 63

*condicioun*: 182

*cost*: 182, 229 n. 96

*coup*: 482

*coupen*: 34, 482

*coupfāre*: 481, 482

*coupman*: 482

*crāven*: 165

*crōk*: 109

*crōked*: 218

*crōken*: 109

*daren*: 434

*derf*: 228, 244, 264, 491

*derfli*: 227, 228, 244, 264

*derfnesse*: 228, 244, 264

*derfshiþe*: 228, 244, 264

*dēvōcioun*: 477

*diēn*: 493–94

'drapen': 499

*dreng*: 197, 491

*droupyng*: 434

*ēch* ('ilk'): 483 n. 10

*eggen*: 217

*ēr*: 241

*ērl*: 490

*ērldōm*: 490

*ērlī*: 241

*ermin*: 155 n. 12

*ēvene*: 233

*fāren mid*: 496

*fasterman*: 169

*fēlaue*: 183, 278

*fēlaushipe*: 183

*fenger*: 63

*fiskcoup* (*fishcoup*): 481, 482

*flēme*: 173

'floyne' ('fleyne'): 37 n. 24

*forēren* ('forbaren'): 499

*fōrēwārd*: 182

*fra* (*fro*): 476, 483

*glāde*: 496

*gere*: 94 n. 112

*gersume*: 190, 483

*gest*: 68

*gest(e)nen*: 68, 238

*gest(e)ninge*: 68, 238

'3o' ('3a'): 399

*God and gōde men*: 498

*grā* (*grō*): 39

*graffe*: 426

*greithen*: 405

*grēva*: 498

*grith*: 187, 406, 494

*grithbriche*: 494

*grithien*: 187

*hāmsökne*: 494

*hāven*: 444

*havene*: 443–44

*hē* ('he'): 220

*hē* ('she'): 220

*heil*: 218

*heining*: 491

*hengen*: 488

*herberwe*: 498

*herberwen*: 498

*hernes*: 491

- hitten* ('hutte'): 117, 239, 244, 264  
*hōlden*: 207  
*holm*: 231  
*hōndfesten*: 497  
*housbōnde*: 216  
*hundred*: 152 n. 9  
*hūsting*: 176, 177  
  
*ich* ('ik'): 483 n. 10  
*infangenethēf*: 498  
*innen*: 494  
  
*kirke*: 483  
*knarre*: 77–78  
*knīf*: 153, 494  
  
*lāh*: 483–84  
*laisen*: 87  
*lāne* (*lōne*): 488–89  
*last*: 378  
*laue*: 159, 490  
*leofand*: 489  
*lēten oute*: 498  
*lite*: 484  
*lith*: 194 n. 55, 195  
*litigere*: 484  
*lōde*: 164 n. 24  
*lōfsōng*: 72  
*lōpen* (*lopte*): 98  
  
*mark*: 471, 484–85  
*mētenīthing*: 495  
*miscrōked*: 224  
*mōl*: 163, 189  
*'mynna'*: 499  
  
*nail knīf*: 153, 494–95  
*nail sax*: 153  
*nayten*: 96  
*nīten*: 96  
*nīthing*: 162, 163  
*norrene*: 218, 222  
  
*ofnām*: 170 n. 33  
*oftāken*: 240, 264  
*ōk*: 499  
*ōrlōk*: 207  
*outlauen*: 490  
  
*overtāken*: 240  
*parcēner* (*partenēre*): 183, 278  
*pēs*: 187, 278, 477  
*pillowbere*: 453  
*ploughlōnd*: 152 n. 9  
*pulewar*: 453, 499  
*prōteccioun*: 187, 278  
  
*quidden*: 165  
  
*rennen*: 218, 482  
*rōte*: 218, 223, 485  
  
*sāke*: 168 n. 28  
*sāked*: 168 n. 28  
*sāklēsse*: 168, 491  
*sanderbode*: 71  
*sandesman*: 71  
*saught*: 485  
*saughte*: 485  
*saughtelen*: 485  
*sax*: 153  
*'scæ'*: 500  
*scateren* ('scattered'): 500  
*schēre*: 58  
*schiften*: 455  
*schillen*: 404  
*scōre*: 152 n. 9  
*scrēmen*: 485–86  
*seint*: 477  
*sēte*: 500–01  
*sīker*: 168  
*skeppe*: 152 n. 9  
*skēr(e)*: 57, 485  
*skēt(e)*: 403, 405  
*skiften*: 455  
*skin*: 154  
*skinnen*: 154  
*skinnere*: 154  
*skot*: 404  
*sol*: 102 n. 126  
*sōndesman*: 238  
*spēken*: 165  
*stēlen* ('stali'): 499  
*stōre*: 121, 218  
*swein*: 218, 221  
*swich* ('swilk'): 483 n. 10  
  
*tāken*: 234–35, 264, 489  
*tāken tō*: 489  
*tenmanlot*: 99 n. 122  
*that*: 487  
*thein*: 211  
*though* (*boh*, 'bop'): 486  
*thraldōm*: 207  
*thrall* (*thrēl*): 69, 208  
*thrēve*: 152 n. 9  
*thrin*: 152 n. 9  
*til*: 253, 276, 419, 476, 492  
*trēsour*: 236, 278  
*turfgrafte*: 426  
*turfgraving*: 426  
  
*'pay(c)'*: 501  
  
*um*: 486–87  
*unnīthing*: 162, 495  
*unsāked*: 168 n. 28  
*unwine*: 501  
  
*wāre*: 453  
*wath*: 62  
*weddinge*: 185  
*wīf*: 110, 220  
*withernām*: 170  
*witnesman*: 492–93  
*witter*: 502  
*witteren*: 502  
*witterlice*: 502  
*witword*: 428  
*wlitī*: 484  
*wōld*: 501  
*wonte*: 466  
*wortrume*: 222  
*wortwāle*: 223  
*wrong*: 466  
*wrongsaught*: 485  
  
*yēten*: 493  
*yēven* ('iafen', 'aiauen'): 499

**Present-Day English***almous*: 420*alms*: 410*awk*: 419*awn*: 495*Crockhurst*: 109 n. 131*dine*: 150*eat*: 150*fat*: 150*give*: 10*Holderness*: 212*Kesteven*: 458*Kirkeby*: 483*knar*: 77*knob*: 77*knot*: 77*knur*: 77*law*: 279*lay*: 84*lie*: 84*mackly*: 423*plump*: 150*Ratley*: 64*Roothill*: 64*scarped*: 424*scatter*: 500*score*: 58*scream*: 486*shatter*: 500*she*: 10, 500*sheer*: 58*shill*: 404*shot*: 404*shream*: 486*skeet*: 403*skep*: 57*skere*: 57*skipa*: 455*skipper*: 403*slate*: 456*staff*: 104 n. 128*take*: 279*they*: 10, 501*thin*: 150*though*: 10*thrall*: 207, 208*till*: 10*treasure*: 236*viking*: 418 n. 18*wath*: 62*wrong*: 466



## 2. Scandinavian Terms

### Viking Age Norse

Unless the term is preceded by an asterisk, the forms given below are those attested in runic inscriptions. Alphabetical order here and as far as the other Scandinavian terms are concerned follows the general principles of Icelandic dictionaries: <ð> follows <d>; <þ>, <æ>, <q>, <ø>, and <æ> appear (in that order) at the end; and long vowels are given after the corresponding short vowel. Collocations including a verb are listed under the verb; collocations where two items are coordinated are given under the first item, while noun phrases with a head and a modifier are given under the head.

*auk*: 119

*aupi*: 37

*bArutR*: 37 n. 23

*bapir* (*bapa*): 90

*bunti* (*bonta*, *bounta*, *bunta*,  
*buonti*): 106

\**fløya*: 38

*fēlaga* (*filaki*): 95

*fra*: 65

*haha*: 40

*hanum*: 40

*iarl*s: 80–81

*karl*: 50

*karuR*: 20

-*kiblip*: 60

*kniri* (*knari*): 76–77

*kuamu*: 39

*kuli*: 409

*kunu(n)kaR*: 67 n. 84

\**lagu*: 20, 32, 61, 84

*lekia*: 54

\**liðu?*: 61

*lipi* (*lis*): 60

*lipsmopr*: 60

\**løysingi*: 87

*makuR*: 20

*mal:s[b]aka*: 47

*marka*: 52

*orostu* (*uristu*, *urustu*): 120

*raþa*: 39

*risþi stin*: 22

*sakir*: 100

*sbA*: 20

*selshofop*: 34

*skaip*: 29

*skib*: 56

*skibari* (*skibara*): 403

*ski(n)þaleubaz*: 58

\**skiplið*: 60

*sot*: 44

*stain*: 28

*stura*: 413

*suain* (*sueinar*): 30

*Sumarliði*: 61

*sunR*: 20

*taupR*: 22, 31

*tirfR* (*tiarfR*): 90 n. 107

\**toft* (\**tōft*): 46

*treks* (*triR*): 92

\**treve*: 425

*trutin*: 45 n. 38

*tuk* (*toku*, *takit*, *takat*): 75

*ualraubar*: 48

*uas* (*uar*, *uaR*): 46

*uikikar* (*uikika*): 418

*uniþik*: 118

*urþu*: 59

*þusi* (*þausi*): 22

\**þóh*: 486

### Old Icelandic

*aðal*: 3 n. 3

*aft*: 429

*aftaka*: 75

*afnám*: 170 n. 33

*almusa* (*olmusa*): 420

*ambótt* (*ambátt*): 420

*argr*: 401

*askr*: 416

*at*: 415, 487

*auk*: 119

*aurar*: 34

*austr* (*i Vík*): 3 n. 3

*ánaud*: 451

*ár* ('early'): 73

*ár* ('fertility')

*til árs ok friðar* (OWN):  
112

*átta*: 44

*áttstafr*: 435

- balkr* (*bolkr*): 401  
*band*: 72  
*barð*: 50  
*barði*: 50  
*báðir*: 90  
*bálkr*: 429–30  
*bátr*: 201 n. 69  
*bendi*: 72  
*bera upp mál*: 47  
*biðja*: 430  
*borð*: 50  
*bóndi* (*bóandi*,  
*búandi*): 106, 212  
*bótlauss*: 431  
*bráð*: 398  
*brenna*: 482  
*broddr*: 408  
*brúðlaup*: 27, 31, 185  
*brúðr*: 31  
*bryggja*: 407  
*brynja*: 62  
*búa*: 106  
*búinn*: 431  
*búza*: 51  
*bregða sér sjúkum*: 431  
*brýtr*: 37 n. 23  
*býr*: 420  
*bæn* (*bön*): 488  
  
*dagr*: 54  
*daudr*: 22, 31  
*deila*  
*deila heiptir*: 419  
*deila sakar*: 419  
*deyja*: 493  
*djarfr*: 90  
*drekkulaun* (OWN): 5, 111  
*drengr*: 92, 197  
*dróttin*: 45 n. 38  
*drúpa*: 434  
*dynja*: 433  
*dönsk tunga*: 4, 221  
  
*efni*: 93  
*eggja*: 55  
*eggbing*: 440  
*eiga* (*átti*): 429  
*einbleypr*: 429  
*einlagi*: 429  
  
*garðr*: 115  
*gata*: 400  
*gefa upp*: 493  
*geirrás*: 419  
*gengi*: 34, 441  
*gersemi* (*gørsemi*, *gersimi*,  
*gørsimi*): 55  
*gervi* (*gørvi*): 94 n. 112  
*gestahús*: 410  
*gestr*: 68  
*gista*: 69  
*gisting*: 68  
*glý*: 441  
*glogggr*: 407  
*grár*: 39  
*gráskinn*: 39, 58  
*greiða*: 114, 115, 405  
*greifi*: 422–23  
*gremja*: 442  
*grey*: 442  
*greyhundr*: 442  
*gríð*: 114, 178  
*gríðabrek*: 115  
*gríðalauss*: 115  
*gríði*: 115  
*gríð*: 114 n. 144  
*gull*: 409  
*gulligr*: 408  
*gullrekinn*: 97  
*Gunni*: 381  
*Gunnvör*: 276  
*göra* (*útlaga verk*): 179  
*gorr*: 20, 55  
  
*halda*: 117  
*hamla*: 116, 206 n. 77  
*til hõmlu*: 116  
*handfesta*: 497  
*handfestr*: 497  
*hanga*: 488  
*haufuð*: 34  
*haukr*  
*gunnar haukr*: 443  
*hár* ('hair'): 39 n. 27  
*hár* ('oar-thole': *háir*,  
 pl.): 40, 41 n. 30, 42,  
 206 n. 77  
*háseti*: 42  
*heðinn*: 406  
  
*elding*: 89  
*embætti*: 420  
*erfi*: 89  
*erfiðl*: 89  
*eyða*: 37  
*eyrir*: 34, 38  
  
*far*: 78  
*fara*: 78  
*fara með*: 496  
*farnask*: 94  
*fat*: 94  
*fá*: 40, 438  
*fá* [*good* / *bad*] *veðr*: 438  
*festa* (OWN): 71, 95  
*festarmaðr* (OWN): 71  
*festr* (OWN): 71, 95  
*festumaðr*: 70  
*fé*: 95  
*félagi*: 5, 95  
*félagskapr*: 95  
*fjórðungr*: 421  
*fley*: 38  
*flotnar*: 437  
*fló*: 41  
*for* (*fyr*): 74  
*formæli* (*formáli*): 47  
*forusta*: 422  
*forvist(a)*: 422  
*forvörðr*: 438  
*fólk*: 437  
*frá*: 65  
*freki*: 446  
*fríðland*: 416  
*fríðr* (OWN): 112, 179  
*fríðheilagr*: 112  
*fríðlauss*: 114  
*fríðmál*: 47  
*friðsgjafi*: 417  
*full*: 439  
*fylki*: 439  
*fýlkja*: 439  
*fyrirgöra fé ok fríði*  
 (OWN): 112  
*fyrri*: 74  
*fierr*: 436  
  
*gall*: 409  
*ganga upp*: 462

- hegna*: 491  
*heill*: 29  
*heimsókn*: 116  
*hemja*: 116  
*herbergi*: 446  
*hirð*: 446  
*hitta*: 117  
*hjarni*: 491  
*hlaup*: 31  
*hlaupa* (*hlupu*, *hljópu*): 27, 97  
*hlaupa út*: 97  
*holmr*: 81  
*honum*: 40  
*hóra*: 447  
*hórkona*: 447  
*hreinn*: 3 n. 3, 30  
*hríð*: 447  
*hrímfrosinn*: 447  
*hrímkaldr*: 447  
*hrjóða*: 447  
*hrosshvalr*: 3 n. 3  
*hundrað*: 98, 406  
*húsbóndi*: 107  
*húskarl*: 52, 446  
*húskarlaping*: 82, 83  
*húsping*: 82, 83  
*hofð* (*haufuð*): 34–35  
*hofðingi*: 34  
*hofn*: 443, 444 n. 36  
*hofuðsmaðr*: 411  
*hóldr* (*hauldr*): 36, 212  
  
*innan*: 494  
*í*: 65  
  
*jarknasteinn*: 435  
*jarl*: 35, 50 n. 53, 81, 212  
*jarldómr*: 81  
*já*: 399  
*játa*: 96  
  
*kalla*: 55, 402  
*kanna*: 432  
*karl*: 50  
*karlfugl*: 51, 219, 378  
*karlmaðr*: 51  
*kaup*: 32  
*kaupa*: 34  
*kaupaland*: 32  
  
*kál*: 409  
*keipull*: 201 n. 69  
*keisari*: 495–96  
*kirkja*: 483  
*klakklauss*: 496  
*knífr*: 107, 108 n. 130  
*knorr* (*knerrir*, pl.): 77, 78,  
 79 n. 95, 202, 203  
*konungar*: 67  
*koppr*: 421  
*kostr*: 108  
*krefja*: 110, 111  
*krókr*: 109  
*kvámu*: 39  
*kveðja*: 5, 110, 111  
*kveða já við*: 432  
*kvennfugl*: 219, 379  
*kyrtel*: 432  
  
*land*: 19  
*land ok láð*: 448  
*landkaup*: 32  
*landnám*: 170 n. 33  
*landsmaðr*: 412  
*laug*: 451  
*láð*: 448  
*lágur*: 484  
*lán*: 489  
*lata*  
*lata út*: 498  
*leggja*: 54, 84, 86  
*leggja lög*: 448  
*leiðangr*: 449  
*lending*: 449  
*leysa*: 87  
*leysingi* (*leysingr*; *leysingar*,  
 pl.): 38, 87, 417  
*lið*: 60, 61  
*liði*: 60, 61  
*liðsmaðr*: 60  
*liggja*: 84  
*liggja í úgildum akri*:  
 2 n. 2, 460  
*liggja veðrfastr*: 465  
*litr*: 64, 484  
*liða*: 60  
*loft* (*lopt*): 72  
*á lopt*: 73  
*lægja*: 86  
  
*lög* (*lag*): 4, 20, 32, 84  
*lögkaup*: 32, 85  
*lögliga*: 86  
*lögligr*: 85  
*lögmaðr*: 86  
*lōgr*: 449  
*lōstr*: 118  
  
*makligr*: 423  
*mannshlutr*: 71, 99  
*mál*: 47, 449–50  
*máldagi*: 47  
*máli*: 47, 450  
*málspakr*: 47  
*mega*: 450  
*merki*: 103  
*minni*: 499  
*mislangr*: 450  
*misstórr*: 450  
*mundr*: 88  
*mundr ok máldagi*: 47  
*munnlauð*: 450  
*mōgr*: 20  
*mōrk*: 52  
*nauðgjald*: 459  
*nauð(b)leyti*: 451  
*nauðmágr*: 451  
*nám*: 39, 170 n. 33  
*nei*: 96  
*neita*: 96  
*ní*: 96  
*níð*: 118  
*níðingr*: 118, 161  
*níta*: 96  
*norraenn* (*nordraenn*): 88  
  
*of*: 415 n. 15  
*ok*: 119  
*orrosta* (*orrausta*, *orresta*): 120  
*oxagang* (*oxnagang*): 418  
*Óðinn*: 467 n. 49  
  
*plóg*: 451  
*plógsland*: 99  
  
*rangr*: 466  
*rangsátt*: 485  
*rann*: 62, 105  
*rauðr*: 59

- ráða*: 39  
*ráða á*: 453  
*rán*: 53  
*rauða rán*: 53 n. 63  
*reisti stein*: 22  
*reka* (\**wreka*): 97  
*renna* ('to make / let run'): 63  
*renna* ('run, course'): 453  
*riðusótt*: 409  
*rjúfa*: 453  
*romshvalr*: 3 n. 3  
*rót*: 64, 65  
*rótfastr*: 65  
*ræðismaðr*: 412  
*ræna*: 53  
*rögg* (< \**rāwwō*): 408  
*röng*: 467  
  
*saklauss*: 101  
*sala*: 454  
*sammáli* (*sammála*): 47  
*sammæli* (*sammáli*): 47  
*sát*: 500  
*sátt*: 42  
*sáttr*: 42  
*sekk*: 453  
*sekr*: 100  
*selja sjálfðæmi*: 419  
*serða*: 101  
*setja*  
*setja af*: 456  
*setja grið*: 456  
*sér*: 276  
*sigla*: 3 n. 3  
*silfrekinn*: 97  
*sitja*: 42  
*skarð*: 454  
*skarpr*: 424  
*skeið* (*skeiðar*, pl.): 29, 203, 205  
*skeppa*: 57  
*skilja*: 404  
*skilja af máli*: 47  
*skinn*: 58  
*skip*: 56  
*skippari*: 403  
*skipta*: 455  
*skipta vápnum*: 445, 464  
*skor*: 58  
  
*skorpa*: 424  
*skot*: 404  
*skrams*: 485  
*skreppa* (*skropinn*, *skorpinn*): 424  
*skrjúpr*: 424  
*skræma*: 485  
*skærr*: 57  
*slá*: 49, 401  
*\*sleita*: 456  
*snara*: 457  
*snekkja*: 457  
*snjallr*: 419  
*sól*: 102  
*sólargaðan*: 496  
*sólarsetr*: 425  
*sólmerki*: 103  
*sótt*: 45  
*sparra*: 402  
*spó* (*spá*): 20  
*stefna* ('to summon'): 457, 458  
*stefna* ('summons'): 457  
*steinn*: 28  
*stika*: 104  
*stórr*: 121  
*strið*: 458  
*stuldr*: 53  
*stýrismaðr*: 413  
*sunr* (*sonr*): 20  
*sveinn*: 2 n. 2, 30  
*sverþing*: 440  
*sæng* (*sæing*): 103  
*sæti*: 500  
*sætt*: 42  
*sætta*: 42  
*söðull*: 236  
*sök*: 100  
  
*taka*: 75  
*taka at*: 489  
*taka á*: 75  
*taka við*: 75  
*taparöx*: 121, 130 n. 3  
*targa*: 402  
*til*: 10, 253, 492  
*tíð*: 406  
*tíðingi*: 406  
*topt* (*tupt*): 46  
*torfgrof*: 425  
  
*tré*: 425  
*tryggva*: 408  
*tvinnr*: 459  
  
*ulfr*: 277  
*um(b)*: 415 n. 15, 487  
*uppganga*: 461  
*urðu*: 59  
*úfriðr*: 416  
*úgrunnr*: 460  
*úgrynni*: 460  
*úlög*: 86  
*úniðingr*: 118  
*úræð*: 461  
*úsekr*: 101  
*útlaga*: 86  
*útlagask*: 86  
*útlagi*: 86  
*útlagr*: 86  
*útleð*: 174  
*útlægja*: 86, 174  
*útlægr*: 86  
*úvinr*: 461  
  
*vað*: 62  
*Vagn*: 224  
*valkyrja*: 464  
*valtrauf*: 48  
*vana*: 464  
*vanr* (*vant*): 466  
*var*: 46  
*vápnaskipti*: 440  
*vápnatak*: 75  
*veðbróðir*: 464  
*veðrfastr*: 465  
*vega*: 439  
*ver*: 452  
*verja*: 452  
*vitnismaðr*: 493  
*vitorð*: 428  
*vitr*: 465  
*vizkr*: 405  
*vikingr*: 418  
*völlr*: 501  
  
*þan*: 419  
*þarfa*: 49  
*þegn*: 27 n. 5, 459, 460 n. 42  
*þegnildi*: 459, 460 n. 42

*þeir* (*þeir(r)a*): 10, 398, 426

*þír* (*þírr*): 69

*þjónusta*: 410

*þorp*: 63

*þó*: 10, 486

*þórr* (*Þúrr*): 45, 411,  
467 n. 49

*þópóru* (< *þó at hváru*): 486

*þrefi*: 104

*þridjungr*: 2 n. 2

*þrinnr* (*þrennr*): 105

*þræll*: 69

*þvengr*: 414

*þýfð*: 53

*þfugr*: 419

*þgn*: 495

*þld*: 462

*þr* (*þrvar*): 400

## Modern Norwegian

*skripen*: 424

## Old Danish

*bóin* (OEN): 431

*bý*: 420

*festeman* (*fæste(r)man*): 71

\**gruthæ* ('gruthæt',

'gruthathæt'): 115

*gæstning*: 68

*gøsum*: 56

*koma*

*koma til genmæl*: 48

*koma til viðrmæles*: 47

*otting*: 418

*styræsmān* (*styrisman*): 413

*sæng* (*siæng, siäng*, OEN): 103

## Modern Danish

*rod*: 65 n. 82

*trave*: 105

## Old Swedish

*biltogher*: 114 n. 143

*fridlauss*: 114 n. 143

*fæst*: 71, 95

*fæstamaþer* (*fæstimaþer*): 71

*gästa*: 69

*gästning*: 68

*höfþinge*: 35 n. 18

*lahgslit*: 86

*lupu*: 97

*saker*: 100

*vitu orþ*: 427

*þrave*: 105

## Modern Swedish

*darra*: 434

*edsöre*: 113

*rot*: 65 n. 82

*trafve*: 105

### 3. Other Germanic Terms

#### Proto-Germanic

<b>, <ð>, <ʒ>, and <x> are treated as equivalent to <b>, <d>, <g>, and <h> for alphabetization, and <þ> is given after <t>. The Proto-Germanic prefix \*<ʒa->, like Gothic <gi->, Old High German and Old Saxon <ga->, and Middle Dutch <ge->, should be discounted.

- |                                      |                                  |                        |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| *abñjan: 93                          | *fōriz: 436                      | *kerlaz: 50            |
| *aʒanō: 495                          | *frawōn: 422                     | *keusanan: 108         |
| *aʒjōjanan: 55                       | *fur(a)- (*furiz, *furistaz): 74 | *knarruz: 77           |
| *airi: 73                            |                                  | *knibaz: 107           |
| *airjaz (> *airiz): 73               | *zallan (*zallōn): 409           | *kraʒjanan: 111 n. 136 |
| *arbjan: 89                          | *ʒaʒanʒja: 441                   | *kustiz: 108           |
| *auke: 119                           | *ʒarð-: 115                      | *kwāmun (NWGmc): 39    |
| *auþjanan: 37                        | *ʒarwaz: 55                      |                        |
|                                      | *ʒarwja-: 55                     | *laʒō: 84              |
| *bai: 90                             | *ʒastiz: 68                      | *laxstran: 118         |
| *balkuz: 430                         | *ʒlawwaz: 407                    | *laxstuz: 118          |
| *balukōn: 401, 430                   | *ʒrāʒaz: 39                      | *laxtraz: 118          |
| *bandān: 72                          | *ʒrāwaz: 39                      | *laixwnaz: 489         |
| *bandjan: 72                         | *ʒrawjan: 442                    | *laixwniz: 489         |
| *bandjō: 72                          |                                  | *lauʒō: 451            |
| *barð-: 50                           | *xabanō: 443                     | *lauwa-: 451           |
| *bōniz: 488                          | *xabuðan: 35                     | *lauwō: 451            |
| *brunjōn: 62                         | *xalipz: 36                      | *lezaz: 484            |
| *bruzðaz: 408                        | *xalupz: 36                      | *leiþanan: 60          |
| *burð-: 50                           | *xam(a)lōn: 116                  | *luft-: 72             |
|                                      | *xanx-: 40, 41                   |                        |
| *ðazaz: 54                           | *xanzanan: 488                   | *maþlan: 46            |
| *ðarbʒaz: 90                         | *xanxanan: 488                   | *maþljanan: 46         |
| *ðauðaz: 31                          | *xanxēnan: 488                   | *munþaz: 45            |
| *ðerbaz: 90                          | *xānomō (NGmc *xānum): 40        |                        |
| *ðranʒ- (*ðranʒjaz,<br>*ðranʒiz): 92 | *xaubudan: 35                    | *nāmūn (NWGmc): 39     |
| *ðruxtīnaz: 45 n. 38                 | *xer(z)nōn: 491                  | *niþan (*niþaz): 118   |
|                                      | *xriþō: 447                      |                        |
| *erilaz: 50 n. 53                    | *in: 65                          | *rādanan (NWGmc): 39   |
| *erknaz: 435                         |                                  | *raxnaz: 53            |
| *erlaz: 50 n. 53                     | *jētjanan: 96                    | *raxnjanan: 53         |
|                                      |                                  | *ʒaraiðjanan: 114, 405 |
| *fanxanan: 40                        | *kaisar: 495                     | *rannjanan: 63         |
| *faran: 78                           | *kalzōjanan: 55                  | *raznan: 62, 105       |
| *fast-: 95                           | *karilaz: 50 n. 53               |                        |
| *flaujōn: 38                         | *karlaz: 50                      | *saxtiz: 43            |
|                                      |                                  | *saxtjanan: 43         |

*\*sakanan*: 43, 116 n. 147  
*\*-samaz*: 56  
*\*samīn*: 55  
*\*sanxt* (*\*sāxt-*): 43–44  
*\*sēt-* (*\*sētō*, *\*sētōn*, *\*sētjan*): 500  
*\*skairjaz*: 57  
*\*skaipān*: 29, 62  
*\*skappjōn*: 57  
*\*skenpān*: 58  
*\*skeutaz*: 403  
*\*skipa-*: 58  
*\*skipan*: 456  
*\*skipaz*: 56  
*\*skipōjanan*: 456  
*\*skurō*: 58  
*\*slaxanan*: 49  
*\*snarxōn*: 457  
*\*soxt*: 44  
*\*sōkjanan*: 43, 116 n. 147  
*\*sōwalō*: 102  
*\*sōwelō*: 102  
*\*stabnjōn*: 457  
*\*stammnjanan*: 458  
*\*stebnjānān*: 458  
*\*stebnō*: 457  
*\*suzelan*: 102  
*\*swezlaz*: 102  
*\*spaxō*: 20  
*\*stainaz*: 28  
*\*sunuz*: 20  
*\*swainaz*: 30  
  
*\*tīdi-*: 406  
*\*trewan*: 425  
*\*tumf(e)tiz*: 46 n. 42  
*\*tumftō*: 46  
*\*twiznaz*: 459  
  
*\*parbōjanan*: 49  
*\*pewiz*: 69  
*\*praxilaz*: 69  
*\*pranxilaz*: 69, 70  
*\*priznaz*: 105  
*\*pūnraz*: 45, 411  
*\*purpan*: 63  
*\*pwanzaz*: 414  
*\*pwanziz*: 414  
  
*\*umbi*: 487

*\*walaz*: 48  
*\*warduz*: 438  
*\*was*: 46  
*\*ulitiz*: 64, 484  
*\*wranzaz*: 466  
*\*wranzō*: 466, 467  
*\*wrenzanan*: 466  
*\*wurðan*: 439  
*\*wurðjan*: 439  
*\*wurðunþ*: 59  
*\*wurt-*: 64

## Gothic

*air* (*airis*): 73  
*airkniþa*: 435  
  
*gairda*: 114  
*gards*: 114  
*griþs*: 114  
  
*hardus* (*hardjana*): 100  
  
*jai* (*ja*): 399  
  
*kustus*: 108  
  
*luftus*: 72  
  
*neiþ*: 118  
  
*gasabts*: 43  
*sauil*: 102  
*skaidan*: 58  
*sōkjan*: 116  
*sunnō*: 102  
  
*tēkan*: 74  
  
*þlaub*: 41  
  
*unairkns*: 435  
*unlêds*: 448  
*unsahþaba*: 44  
  
*waurts*: 64  
*wruggo*: 467

## Old Frisian

*bande*: 72  
*bende*: 72  
*bêthe*: 90  
*brigge* (*bregge*): 407  
  
*derve*: 90  
  
*êr*: 73  
  
*fêre* ('benefit'): 436  
*fêre* ('conductive'): 436  
*fiardunge*: 422  
*fretholâsi*: 114  
  
*hâmsêke(ne)* (*hâmsêkinge*): 116  
*hingia*: 488  
  
*jarla*: 81 n. 97  
  
*kella*: 55  
*kest*: 108  
*knif*: 107  
  
*laster*: 118  
*lezda*: 84  
*lidza* (*liga*): 84  
  
*merk*: 52  
*mond*: 88  
  
*plôch*: 451  
  
*rêdesmon*: 412  
  
*sêka*: 116 n. 147  
*sekk*: 453  
*skifta*: 455  
*skilla*: 404  
*skipia*: 456  
*stôr*: 121  
*sunne*: 102  
  
*til*: 492  
*thrîna*: 105  
  
*wita* ('witness'): 428  
*wita* (*weta*; 'to know'): 428



**Northern Frisian***traav*: 104*ünsächt*: 45**Old Saxon***abuh* (*avuh*): 419*band*: 72*bethia*: 90*derbi*: 90*ênlôpi*: 429*êr*: 73*erl*: 81*gifôri*: 436*galla*: 409*gigengi*: 441*grêve*: 423*heriberga*: 446*krukka*: 109*gilagu*: 84*lastar*: 118*legar*: 84*leggian*: 84*liggian*: 84*luft*: 72*nith*: 118*orlag*: 84*skepil*: 57*skap*: 57*snari*: 457*stôri*: 121*strid* (*strîð*): 458*sunna*: 102*wurt*: 64**Middle Low German***bûtze* (*bûse*): 51 n. 54*dên(e)st*: 410*handveste*: 497*havene*: 444*hegenen*: 491*herne*: 491*holm*: 82*hòveding* (*hovetlink*): 34*knîf*: 107*lantman*: 412*lucht*: 73*mark*: 52*schiften*: 455*schillen*: 404*schinden* (*schinnen*): 58*schippen*: 456*schippere*: 403*shore*: 58*schrepel*: 424*serden*: 102*snare*: 457*stevenen*: 458*tîdinge*: 407*vredelôs*: 114*wrange*: 467*wrank* (*wrange*): 466**Middle Dutch***bedaren*: 434*cnijf*: 107*cop*(*p*): 421*drûpen*: 434*handveste*: 497*hegenen*: 491*herberge*: 446*lachter*: 118*laster*: 118*gemackelijc*: 423*schrepel*: 424*seerden*: 102*snare*: 457*snicke*: 457*tîdinge*: 406*wrangh* (*wranc*): 466**Flemish***verdaren*: 434**Old High German***abuh* (*abah*): 419*bant*: 72*beide* (*bêde*): 90*birahanen*: 53*breit*: 399*bruca*: 407*brütlouft*: 27*bûzo*: 51*chopf*: 421*dionôst*: 410*êr*: 73*ercan*: 435*ernust*: 120*fiordung*: 422*fulken*: 440*gifuori* ('benefit'): 436*gifuori* ('appropriate'): 436*furiro*: 74

*galla*: 409  
*gnarrun*: 78, 202

*hamila*: 116  
*hantfesti*: 497  
*heil*: 29  
*heim(e)suochunge*: 116  
*hengen*: 488  
*her(e)berga*: 446  
*hirni*: 4  
*(h)ridón*: 447

*(gi)já(ez)zen*: 96

*kallôn*: 55  
*keisur (keisar)*: 495  
*krâcho*: 109  
*krucka*: 109

*landman*: 412  
*lastar*: 118  
*legar*: 84

*leggen*: 84  
*liggen*: 84  
*lôz*: 98 n. 118  
*luft*: 72

*gimablib*: 423

*nordróni*: 88

*pfluog*: 451

*girennan*: 63  
*ringan*: 466

*sala*: 454  
*gisâzi*: 500–01  
*scaffo*: 57  
*sceffil*: 57  
*sceidan*: 58  
*scidôn*: 58  
*scindan*: 58  
*sertan*: 101

*snacga*: 457  
*snaraha*: 457  
*stôri*: 121  
*sunna*: 102  
*urlag*: 84

*wat*: 62  
*wurz*: 64

## Middle High German

*buenen*: 431

*habene*: 444  
*heinen*: 491  
*holm*: 82

*mark*: 52

*nîdinc*: 118

*vridelôs*: 114

*zîtunge*: 407

## 4. Other Indo-European Terms

### Proto-Indo-European

\**b<sup>h</sup>ā-*: 431  
 \**b<sup>h</sup>ord<sup>h</sup>-*: 50  
 \**b<sup>h</sup>rd<sup>h</sup>-*: 50

\**deH<sub>1</sub>g-*: 74  
 \**d<sup>h</sup>ereg<sup>h</sup>-*: 92  
 \**duisno-*: 459

\**g<sup>h</sup>el-*: 409  
 \**g<sup>h</sup>er-* (\**g<sup>h</sup>(e)reH<sub>2</sub>it-*,  
     \**g<sup>h</sup>(e)rit-*): 114–15  
 \**g<sup>h</sup>erd<sup>h</sup>-*: 114–15  
 \**g<sup>h</sup>ol-*: 409  
 \**g<sup>h</sup>ord<sup>h</sup>-*: 115  
 \**g<sup>h</sup>ort-*: 115  
 \**g<sup>h</sup>red<sup>h</sup>-* (\**g<sup>h</sup>reid<sup>h</sup>-*): 114  
 \**g<sup>h</sup>rid<sup>h</sup>-*: 115

\**kel-*: 117 n. 149

\**kreit-*: 447

\**leit-*: 60

\**nīt-*: 118

\**prō-uo-*: 422

\**-rēid<sup>h</sup>-*: 114, 405

\**urd-*: 64  
 \**ureH<sub>2</sub>d-*: 64

\**skito-*: 58  
 \**sknto-*: 58  
 \**squito-*: 58

\**treip-*: 104  
 \**trikno-*: 105  
 \**trisno-*: 105

### Tocharian B

*käl(t)s-*: 117 n. 149

### Sanskrit

*grhá-*: 114

*hári-*: 409

*kaláyati*: 117 n. 149

### Avestan

*zairi-*: 409

**Greek**

δρόμων: 50  
 κέλλω: 117 n. 149  
 μυγαλή: 155  
 ῥάδιξ: 64  
 χάρις: 114

**Latin**

*accipere hospitium*:  
 237 n. 101

*adulterium*: 401  
*albus*: 399  
*ancilla*: 208, 266  
*ante*: 74, 439 n. 31  
*antefata*: 438  
*appendix*: 152  
*applicare*: 449  
*applicatio*: 449  
*aratrum*: 452  
*arescere*: 424  
*arista*: 495  
*armoracia*: 409  
*artavus*: 153  
*audax*: 227, 266  
*aura*: 34  
*aureus*: 38  
*austerus*: 424  
*ausus*: 227, 266

*bascuada*: 451  
*boni homines*: 498  
*buza (bucia, ML)*: 51

*caput*: 35  
*caulis*: 409  
*caupo*: 32, 34  
*caupona*: 34  
*caupulus (ML)*: 202  
*caverna*: 467  
*cavernamen*: 467  
*cercylus*: 205  
*chirographum*: 497  
*clausus*: 402  
*cocus*: 208 n. 78  
*comes*: 215 n. 84

*compilare*: 33  
*concitare*: 217, 256, 266  
*concordare*: 375 n. 13  
*concordia*: 375 n. 13  
*confidere*: 408  
*consul*: 80 n. 96, 215 n. 85  
*conviator*: 441  
*copa*: 34  
*copo*: 34  
*cupo*: 34  
*cuppa (coppa, ML)*: 421  
*cutis*: 155

*decretum*: 377  
*deficere*: 493  
*dicio*: 387  
*domicilium*: 420  
*dominus*: 208  
*dromo*: 50, 204, 205  
*dux*: 213, 215 n. 85, 376

*elocutio*: 47  
*eunuchus*: 110, 220  
*exigere*: 111  
*exlex*: 87, 174  
*extorris*: 174  
*exul*: 174  
*exultare*: 237 n. 101

*facere*: 493  
*fari (fatus)*: 439 n. 31  
*furtum*: 54, 160  
*fururari*: 160

*gnomon*: 232  
*gramen*: 408  
*gratis*: 266  
*gubernator*: 413 n. 13  
*gustus*: 108

*haraidum* ('hariraida',  
 'heriraita'): 117 n. 148

*helvus*: 409  
*horologium*: 233  
*hospes*: 238  
*hospita*: 215 n. 87  
*hospitari*: 237, 243

*immunis*: 496  
*ius*: 174

*judicare*: 248

*lapsana*: 409  
*latrina*: 440  
*lavare*: 451  
*lectus*: 226  
*leporarius*: 437  
*leprosus*: 437  
*lex*: 159, 174, 470 n. 2  
*liber*: 210  
*libra*: 255–56, 267  
*liburna*: 205  
*litteratura*: 399

*major*: 463  
*malleolus*: 133  
 (Table 5, note)  
*mandatum*: 497  
*mane*: 74, 267  
*manicare*: 255 n. 8  
*manufirmatio*: 497  
*marca (marcus, ML)*: 52  
*mastruca*: 406  
*materia*: 93, 232, 267  
*mercimonium*: 33 n. 15  
*mina*: 255–56, 267  
*modo*: 267  
*modus*: 229, 267, 269  
*moechari*: 101, 240, 267  
*mōrus*: 34  
*munus*: 191

*navicula*: 202, 267  
*navis actuaria*: 80, 203  
*nitela*: 155  
*Norrenses*: 88 n. 105  
*Nortmanni*: 221  
*novacula*: 153, 494  
*nuptiae*: 185, 267, 269  
*nuptialis*: 268

*occasus*: 424–25  
*occidens*: 424  
*occidere*: 49  
*offerens*: 98  
*oppilare*: 402  
*opportunus*: 423  
*optio*: 229

*parcus*: 495  
*paterfamilias*: 215, 216  
*patriota*: 412  
*peccatrix*: 400  
*perverus*: 419  
*phylacteria*: 414  
*pirata*: 205  
*ponere iudicium*: 448  
*porca*: 401  
*portio*: 98 n. 118  
*praefectus*: 213  
*praesumptio*: 227  
*princeps*: 213, 214 n. 82  
*prosperare*: 228, 267

*radix*: 64  
*Roma*: 34

*sacer*: 44  
*salebrosus*: 466  
*sancire*: 44  
*sartago*: 398–99  
*scapha*: 203–04 n. 72  
*scitum*: 174  
*securis*: 267  
*securus*: 267  
*senectus*: 464  
*servus*: 208, 267, 268  
*setosa*: 407  
*sodalis*: 405  
*sōl*: 102  
*solitarius*: 429  
*sponsus*: 215  
*sternere*: 226  
*stramentum*: 236  
*stratum*: 226, 256, 267

*taurus*: 94  
*temeritas*: 227, 267  
*terni*: 105  
*testamentum*: 428

*testari*: 428  
*testis*: 428  
*thoraca*: 145 (Table 14,  
 third note)  
*tribunus*: 213, 267  
*trieris*: 203–04 n. 72  
*trini*: 105  
*trinus*: 105

*vendere*: 33 n. 15, 454  
*venditio*: 454  
*vescada*: 451  
*via*: 229

## Anglo-Norman

*arraie (arai)*: 117

*bataille*: 167  
*bucekarle*: 196 n. 59

*parcener*: 278  
*pes*: 278  
*proteccioun*: 278

*tresor*: 278

## Old French

*bruine*: 481  
*bucecarl*: 51

*cnivet (canivet)*: 108 n. 130

*escot (escote)*: 404

*flouin*: 37 n. 24

*kenar*: 78, 202

*loi*: 159

*targe*: 402

## Langue d'oïl

*tot (topt)*: 46 n. 43

## Old Irish

*bán*: 431

*cna(i)rr*: 78, 202

*iarla*: 81 n. 97

## Old Welsh

\**caupol*: 201 n. 69, 202

## Breton

*caubal*: 201 n. 69

## Gaelic

*cnarra*: 202 n. 70

## Old Slavonic

*gridi*: 115

*grizdq(griditi)*: 115

*toporū*: 121, 130 n. 3

## 5. Terms from Non-Indo-European Languages

### Aramaic

*jarkā*: 435

### Chaldaic

*jarkān*: 435

### Finnish

*karilas*: 50 n. 53



## STUDIES IN THE EARLY MIDDLE AGES

All volumes in this series are evaluated by an Editorial Board, strictly on academic grounds, based on reports prepared by referees who have been commissioned by virtue of their specialism in the appropriate field. The Board ensures that the screening is done independently and without conflicts of interest. The definitive texts supplied by authors are also subject to review by the Board before being approved for publication. Further, the volumes are copyedited to conform to the publisher's stylebook and to the best international academic standards in the field.

### **Titles in Series**

*Cultures in Contact: Scandinavian Settlement in England in the Ninth and Tenth Centuries*, ed. by Dawn M. Hadley and Julian D. Richards (2000)

*On Barbarian Identity: Critical Approaches to Ethnicity in the Early Middle Ages*, ed. by Andrew Gillett (2002)

Matthew Townend, *Language and History in Viking Age England: Linguistic Relations between Speakers of Old Norse and Old English* (2002)

*Contact, Continuity, and Collapse: The Norse Colonization of the North Atlantic*, ed. by James H. Barrett (2003)

*Court Culture in the Early Middle Ages: The Proceedings of the First Alcuin Conference*, ed. by Catherine Cubitt (2003)

*Political Assemblies in the Earlier Middle Ages*, ed. by P. S. Barnwell and Marco Mostert (2003)

*Wulfstan, Archbishop of York: The Proceedings of the Second Alcuin Conference*, ed. by Matthew Townend (2004)

*Borders, Barriers, and Ethnogenesis: Frontiers in Late Antiquity and the Middle Ages*, ed. by Florin Curta (2006)

John D. Niles, *Old English Enigmatic Poems and the Play of the Texts* (2006)

*Teaching and Learning in Northern Europe, 1000–1200*, ed. by Sally N. Vaughn and Jay Rubenstein (2006)

*Narrative and History in the Early Medieval West*, ed. by Elizabeth M. Tyler and Ross Balzaretti (2006)

*People and Space in the Middle Ages, 300–1300*, ed. by Wendy Davies, Guy Halsall, and Andrew Reynolds (2006)

John D. Niles, *Old English Heroic Poems and the Social Life of Texts* (2007)

*The Crisis of the Oikoumene: The Three Chapters and the Failed Quest for Unity in the Sixth-Century Mediterranean*, ed. by Celia Chazelle and Catherine Cubitt (2007)

*Text, Image, Interpretation: Studies in Anglo-Saxon Literature and its Insular Context in Honour of Eamonn O Carragain*, ed. by Alastair Minnis and Jane Roberts (2007)

*The Old English Homily: Precedent, Practice, and Appropriation*, ed. by Aaron J. Kleist (2007)

James T. Palmer, *Anglo-Saxons in a Frankish World, 690–900* (2009)

*Challenging the Boundaries of Medieval History: The Legacy of Timothy Reuter*, ed. by Patricia Skinner (2009)

Peter Verbist, *Duelling with the Past: Medieval Authors and the Problem of the Christian Era, c. 990–1135* (2010)

*Reading the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle: Language, Literature, History*, ed. by Alice Jorgensen (2010)

*England and the Continent in the Tenth Century: Studies in Honour of Wilhelm Levison (1876–1947)*, ed. by David Rollason, Conrad Leyser, and Hannah Williams (2010)

*Early Medieval Northumbria: Kingdoms and Communities, AD 450–1100*, ed. by David Petts and Sam Turner (2011)

*Conceptualizing Multilingualism in Medieval England, c. 800–c. 1250*, ed. by Elizabeth M. Tyler (2011)

*Neglected Barbarians*, ed. by Florin Curta (2011)

*The Genesis of Books: Studies in the Scribal Culture of Medieval England in Honour of A. N. Doane*, ed. by Matthew T. Hussey and John D. Niles (2012)

Giselle de Nie, *Poetics of Wonder: Testimonies of the New Christian Miracles in the Late Antique Latin World* (2012)



Lilla Kopár, *Gods and Settlers: The Iconography of Norse Mythology in Anglo-Scandinavian Sculpture* (2012)

R. W. Burgess and Michael Kulikowski, *Mosaics of Time: The Latin Chronicle Traditions from the First Century BC to the Sixth Century AD, vol. I: A Historical Introduction to the Chronicle Genre from its Origins to the High Middle Ages* (2013)

*Sacred Sites and Holy Places: Exploring the Sacralization of Landscape through Space and Time*, ed. by Sæbjørg Walaker Nordeide and Stefan Brink (2013)

## **In Preparation**

*Landscapes of Defence in Early Medieval Europe*, ed. by John Baker, Stuart Brookes, and Andrew Reynolds

Christine Maddern, *Raising the Dead: Early Medieval Name Stones in Northumbria*

*Society and Culture in Medieval Rouen, 911–1300*, ed. by Leonie V. Hicks and Elma Brenner

Shane McLeod, *The Beginning of Norse Settlement in England: The Viking 'Great Army' and Early Settlers, c. 865–900*

